RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

Funding Opportunity Announcement No. 09SF200001

Central Valley Project Conservation Program and Central Valley Project Improvement Act Habitat Restoration Program

Fiscal Year 2009

U.S. Department of the Interior / U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bureau of Reclamation California and Nevada Regional Office
Mid-Pacific Region
http://www.usbr.gov/mp/

August 2008

Central Valley Project Conservation Program and Central Valley Project Improvement Act Habitat Restoration Program

Department of the Interior / U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bureau of Reclamation California and Nevada Regional Office
Mid Pacific Region
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OVERVIEW

Agency Names:	Department of the Interior, Bureau of Reclamation, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Sacramento, California
Funding Opportunity Title:	Central Valley Project Conservation Program and Central Valley Project Improvement Act Habitat Restoration Program
Announcement Type:	Initial announcement
Funding Opportunity Announcement No. (FOA):	09SF200001
Application Due Date:	Applications due **November 14, 2008**, 3:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time (PST)
Eligible Applicants:	As described in Section III.A.
Program Authority:	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended, 16 U.S.C. Section 661 et seq, of 1956; Central Valley Project Improvement Act Public Law 102-575, Title XXXIV, 3406(b)(1)
Catalog for Domestic Assistance (CFDA)	15.517
Cost Share:	No cost sharing requirement, but level of partnering is considered during proposal evaluation
Estimated number of agreements to be awarded	10-15
Total amount of funding available for award:	Estimated $3,200,000.00

PROPOSAL CHECKLIST

The following table contains a summary of the information that you are required to submit.

SUBMIT ONE ORIGINAL AND TWO COPIES			
	What to Submit	**Required Content**	**REQUIRED FORM OR FORMAT**
	• Cover Page	See Sec. IV.C.1	Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Standard Form (SF 424*, Application for Federal Assistance
	• Assurances	See Sec. IV.C.2	Office of Management and Budget (OMB), SF 424B* or SF 424D*, as applicable
	• Written Project Proposal	See Sec. IV.C.3	Written proposal in accordance with specified format in this section.
	• Regulatory Compliance	See Sec. IV.C.2.5	Applicants are required to comply with all applicable state, Federal, and local environmental, cultural, and paleontological resource protection laws and regulations.
	Budget Information	Sec. IV.D	Office of Management and Budget (OMB) SF 424A* Budget Information (Non-Construction Programs) or SF 424C* (Construction Programs), as applicable
	Budget Narrative	IV.D	Describe how each budget item relates to the project activity and provide clear rationale/breakdown for the amount of each budget item. Award will not be made to any applicant who fails to provide narrative information.
	Budget Proposal	IV.D	The activity budget should include sufficient **detailed** information to enable Reclamation to evaluate the reasonableness of the budgeted amount.
*FORMS MAY BE DOWNLOADED FROM WWW.GRANTS.GOV UNDER THE FUNDING OPPORTUNITY, 09SF200001, FULL ANNOUNCEMENT OR APPLICATION			

SECTION I – GENERAL INFORMATION

I.A BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Central Valley Project Conservation Program (CVPCP) was developed during the Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation process to ensure that the existing operation of the Central Valley Project (CVP), implementation of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA), and renewal of CVP water service contracts would not jeopardize listed or proposed species or adversely affect designated or proposed critical habitat. Accordingly, the CVPCP implements actions that will protect, restore, and enhance special-status species and their habitats affected by the CVP, with a special emphasis on federally listed species. The CVPIA Habitat Restoration Program (HRP) was established under Title XXXIV, Section 3406 (b) (1) of the CVPIA. The HRP also implements actions to improve conditions for species impacted by the CVP.

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) funds may range from $5,000 to $1,000,000 on approved projects.

1.B PROGRAM AUTHORITY

This Funding Opportunity Announcement is issued in accordance with the authority of Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended, 16 U.S.C. Section 661 et seq, of 1956; Public Law 102-575, Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Title XXXIV, Section 3406(b)(1).

I.C PROGRAM OBJECTIVE

Open solicitation of grant opportunities through the CVPCP and HRP will facilitate meeting the objectives of the programs. Public outreach and solicitation helps ensure the programs receive a sufficient volume of quality proposals carrying out conservation actions pursuant to the programs' short and long term goals.

I.D. OBJECTIVE OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITY ANNOUNCEMENT

The objective of the competitive solicitation is to ensure compliance with competition requirements related to Federal financial agreements and to ensure public participation in the CVPCP and HRP.

I.D.1. Evaluation Criteria. See Section V.

I.E. ELIGIBLE PROJECTS

DESCRIPTION OF ELIGIBLE ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAM PRIORITIES

The CVPCP and HRP fund a variety of actions that improve conditions for species and habitats impacted by the CVP, recognizing that a balanced set of actions is needed to meet the stated objectives. The CVPCP and HRP have, however, placed emphasis on certain kinds of activities considered more critical to species' protection and recovery than others. A list of projects previously funded by the programs can be found on the programs' website: www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp. Funds are generally distributed as indicated below for the following activities:

1) Fee Title/Easement Acquisition: Protection of species or existing habitats impacted by the CVP through the purchase of fee title or conservation easements on lands where threats to these lands are significant. Approximately 50 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds are directed towards this proposed activity.

2) Habitat Restoration: Restoration of CVP-impacted habitats where restoration actions will markedly improve conditions for impacted species. Approximately 20 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds are directed towards this proposed activity.

3) Research: Research addressing status, habitat needs, and behavior of CVP-impacted species that will facilitate species recovery. Research priorities are action specific. **A submitted proposal will not be ranked if it does not target at least one of the research priorities specified in the FOA.** Approximately 20 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds are directed towards this proposed activity.

4) Outreach/Planning/Other: Public outreach and education, formulation of land management plans, and other activities that generally contribute to improving conditions for CVP-impacted species and habitats. Approximately 10 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds are directed towards this proposed activity.

Fiscal Year 2009 Priorities

The CVPCP and HRP have established priorities related to species, habitats, and geographic areas. Well-conceived proposals that address the priorities listed below will be given preference during proposal review. These priorities have been developed specifically for fiscal year 2009. They reflect the most current evaluation of species needs and habitat trends and are complementary to other on-going actions within the Central Valley. They also take into account historical levels of investment as well as future threats to specific ecosystems. The following are CVPCP and HRP priorities for fiscal year 2009. They are in order of preference within each category, except for Research priorities. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks found in the Recovery Plans associated with the species and habitats listed below:

A. Acquisition Priorities

1. *Serpentine soil and associated habitats supporting endemic species, such as the bay checkerspot butterfly and serpentine plants, in Santa Clara County*. For this habitat and geographic priority, the CVPCP and HRP will consider proposals that preserve existing habitat and provide for the protection and management of occupied and unoccupied serpentine grasslands that act as corridors or stepping stones between known populations of bay checkerspot butterfly and other listed serpentine species. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for serpentine species found in the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a).

2. *Habitat protection activities in eastern Alameda County that will help conserve listed species located there.* Priority will be given to conservation actions for (a) chaparral/grassland/oak savannah matrix important for Alameda whipsnake feeding, breeding, dispersal, and movement; (b) grassland habitat that provides breeding, dispersal, and colonization opportunities for California tiger salamander; (c) aquatic breeding and upland movement/aestivation habitat for California red-legged frog; and (d) vernal pool habitat that supports listed crustaceans. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks for Alameda County species found in the following recovery plans: *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b), *Draft Recovery Plan for Chaparral and Scrub Community Species East of San Francisco Bay, California* (USFWS 2002a), *Recovery Plan for the California red-legged frog* (USFWS 2002b), and *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005).

3. *Gabbro soil plants protection*. Rapid development and escalating land values in and around the Preserve make additional land protection one of the highest priorities for the recovery of these species. Land acquisition, with representation of the specific plant species, is a priority one task of the 2002 *Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills* (USFWS

2002c). Acquisition lands which have one or more of the following characteristics will be given the highest priority: 1) are occupied by more than one of the listed gabbro soils plants, with highest priority given to parcels that support the endangered El Dorado bedstraw, Stebbins morning glory, or Pine Hill flannelbush, and other federally listed plant species; and 2) are within or outside of the Pine Hill Preserve and adjacent to existing protected lands.

4. *Vernal pool habitats throughout the Central Valley supporting federally-listed vernal pool invertebrates, California tiger salamander, and listed plant species including slender Orcutt grass, Greene's tuctoria, Colusa grass, Hoover's spurge, and fleshy-owl's clover*. Actions will be considered that protect, through fee title or easement acquisition, existing vernal pool complexes supporting listed species in Zone 1 and Zone 2 Core Areas (especially sites that are known to be inhabited by narrowly endemic federally-listed species). Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks in Zones 1 and 2 Core Areas for vernal pool species found in the *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005).

5. *San Joaquin Valley floor habitat protection*. Acquire through fee title, or conservation easement alkali sink, alkali scrub, and valley grassland habitat located on the western floor of the San Joaquin Valley that contributes to the core and satellite population areas and habitat linkages and corridors for San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, Tipton kangaroo rat, giant kangaroo rat, Fresno kangaroo rat, Buena Vista Lake shrew, federally-listed plant species, particularly Bakersfield cactus, and other species dependent upon this habitat complex. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for these species found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b).

6. *San Joaquin Valley rangeland protection*. Working with partners, such as California Rangeland Trust or California Rangeland Coalition, acquire conservation easements on the rangelands between the Ciervo-Panoche and State Route 152 (south of Santa Nella) on the west side of the San Joaquin Valley in Merced and Fresno Counties. Rangeland targeted should be suitable for the San Joaquin kit fox, California tiger salamander, and/or California red-legged frog, and should be adjacent to existing protected lands (e.g., protected through a conservation easement). Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for these species found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b), and *Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged frog* (USFWS 2002b).

7. *Protection of habitat for the palmate-bracted bird's-beak*. Acquire about 180 acres at Springtown Alkali Sink, Alameda County; remaining lands surrounding Alkali Grassland Preserve, Yolo County; and private lands in western Madera County. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for these species found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b).

8. *Wetland and associated uplands supporting species such as giant garter snake and valley elderberry longhorn beetle; riparian and other aquatic habitat supporting riparian brush rabbit, riparian woodrat, California red-legged frog, and neotropical migratory birds, with a special emphasis on the San Joaquin Valley.* Actions will be considered that protect habitat, through fee title or easement acquisition. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks for species found in the following recovery plans: *Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Recovery Plan* (USFWS 1984), *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley*, *California* (USFWS 1998b), *Recovery Plan for the California red-legged frog* (USFWS 2002b), *Final Recovery Plan, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher* (USFWS 2002d), and *Draft Recovery Plan for the Least Bell's Vireo* (USFWS 1998c).

<u>*NOTE</u>: Appraisals for proposed acquisition parcels must be carried our under the supervision of the Department of Interior's (DOI) Appraisal Service's Directorate (ASD) to ensure appraisals meet DOI standards. Appraisals submitted without DOI/ASD guidance will most likely not be approved.

B. <u>Restoration Priorities</u>

1. *Serpentine soil and associated habitats supporting endemic species, such as the bay checkerspot butterfly and serpentine plants, in Santa Clara County*. For this habitat and geographic priority, the CVPCP and HRP are particularly interested in proposals that emphasize restoration of degraded habitat by reintroduction of grazing, protection from overgrazing, etc. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for serpentine species found in the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a).

2. *Continuation of the Lange's metalmark captive breeding program and for continued restoration of riverine dune habitat at the Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge*. Actions will be considered that provide for maintaining labor, supplying nursery services to raise and out-plant the three rare plants (Antioch Dunes evening primrose, Contra Costa wallflower, and auriculate naked-stemmed buckwheat), removing invasive plants, and for purchasing and distributing suitable sand ground cover. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for these species identified in the *Revised Recovery Plan for Three Endangered Species Endemic to Antioch Dunes, California* (USFWS 1980).

3. *Ecosystem restoration that results in the following vegetation types: alkali sink, alkali scrub, and valley grassland habitat*. Restoration located in the western foothills and valley floor of the San Joaquin Valley that contributes to species recovery will be prioritized. The restoration effort should benefit core and satellite population areas, as well as habitat linkages and corridors for the following federally-listed species: San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, Tipton kangaroo rat, giant kangaroo rat, Fresno kangaroo rat and Buena Vista Lake shrew. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for these species found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b).

4. *Habitat management activities in eastern Alameda County and eastern Contra Costa County that will help conserve listed species located there*. Projects will be considered that protect (a) chaparral/grassland/oak savannah matrix important for Alameda whipsnake feeding, breeding, dispersal, and movement; (b) grassland habitat that provides breeding, dispersal, and colonization opportunities for California tiger salamander; (c) aquatic breeding and upland movement/aestivation habitat for California red-legged frog; (d) vernal pool habitat that supports listed crustaceans; and (e) grassland habitats used by San Joaquin kit fox that provide regional linkage between Contra Costa County and areas outside the County. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks for Alameda County species found in the following recovery plans: *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b), *Draft Recovery Plan for Chaparral and Scrub Community Species East of San Francisco Bay, California* (USFWS 2002a), *Recovery Plan for the California red-legged frog* (USFWS 2002b), and *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005).

5. *Wetland and associated uplands supporting species such as giant garter snake and valley elderberry longhorn beetle; riparian and other aquatic habitat supporting riparian brush rabbit, riparian woodrat, California red-legged frog, and neotropical migratory birds, with a special emphasis on the San Joaquin Valley.* Actions will be considered that restore habitat and establish refugia for species in flood zones. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks for species found in the following recovery plans: *Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Recovery Plan* (USFWS 1984), *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valle*y, *California* (USFWS

1998b), *Recovery Plan for the California red-legged Frog* (USFWS 2002b), *Final Recovery Plan, Southwestern Willow Flycatcher* (USFWS 2002d), *Draft Recovery Plan for the Least Bell's Vireo* (USFWS 1998c), and *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake* (USFWS 1999).

C. Research Priorities

Research priorities are considered action specific, therefore only proposals that address the actions specified below will be considered for ranking:

1. *Serpentine soil and associated habitats supporting endemic species, such as the bay checkerspot butterfly and serpentine plants, in Santa Clara County.* Proposals will be considered that develop propagation techniques for listed plants and host and nectar plants of the bay checkerspot butterfly. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for serpentine species found in the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a).

2. *Reintroduction efforts of the California jewelflower have failed. Information related to germination, propagation, soil conditions, water and nutrient conditions for the species in Kern and Fresno Counties is needed in order to improve the likelihood of success of future reintroduction efforts*. This action would fulfill a recovery recommendation from the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley* (USFWS 1998b).

3. *Design and conduct a study assessing the success (long and short-term) of created and restored vernal pool wetlands*. Success factors should include an assessment of listed branchiopods and floristic composition in constructed/restored and reference vernal pools. Study should include an assessment of various wetland design metrics and techniques across a focused landscape of vernal pool classifications including soil types and other physical features. The findings and report should support recommendations on various design metrics and techniques and intended to support future studies and recommendations pertaining to vernal pool construction and monitoring. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks for vernal pool species found in the *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005).

4. *Map and quantify the acreage of occupied, suitable, and historic habitat within core areas for all species covered in the Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon (USFWS 2005)*. Core areas located in Sacramento, Placer, and Merced Counties have the highest priority. An assessment of the acreage and location of occupied, suitable, and historical vernal pool habitat within the core areas is the necessary first step to determine recovery goals for each species in the recovery plan and to assess the amount and location of habitat that is needed to be protected to meet the goals. Development of a single habitat assessment method will be most efficient. The method needs to be consistent, based on GIS, remote sensing, ground-truthed mapping, and ground-truthed information on the species habitat, and applicable across all vernal pool species, recovery regions, and core areas. This information will form the baseline for all future assessments on amount of occupied, potential and historical habitat within the core areas. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks found in the *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005). Products of this research are maps of each core area showing occupied, historical and suitable habitat for each listed vernal pool species occurring in that core area. Due to the high number of species addressed in the Recovery Plan, we expect that proposals will likely focus on a single species and a limited number of core areas; however, the analysis methods must be applicable to all species and core areas. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service - Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office's GIS branch should be consulted during project design in order to ensure all work products will be consistent with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service GIS needs.

5. *Develop methods to control waxy mannagrass, a nonnative plant species that invades vernal pools supporting federally-listed plants and animals.* The invasive, nonnative grass, waxy mannagrass, is becoming a serious plant pest in vernal pools in California. Since it was first found in California in 1953, the grass has spread throughout shallow natural and man-made wetlands along the eastern Central Valley of California. It is now reported to occur in Shasta, Tehama, Butte, Yuba, Placer, Sacramento, San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Fresno, Mendocino, Sonoma, and Alameda Counties (The Nature Conservancy 2006). Mannagrass has become established in vernal pools supporting federally-listed plants and animals. Proposals for control of mannagrass should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks for listed species that co-occur with mannagrass found in the *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005). Research topics should include, but are not limited to, results of tests on control methods such as grazing, burning, herbicides, hand removal, and other non-chemical methods that will not also kill or harm any co-occurring listed species. Additionally, life history of mannagrass, methods of plant and seed dispersal, germination requirements, and seed production should also be addressed in sufficient depth to provide background data for understanding the control methods testing results and the recommendations. Recommendations regarding prevention of introduction of mannagrass to wetlands and whether control methods should vary by geographic area also should be included.

6. *Status surveys for listed species particularly those that will be the subject of 5-Year reviews in 2010.* For many federally-listed species in California, particularly plants, at least some occurrences have not been visited or surveyed in 10 years or more. Determining appropriate recovery actions is difficult without ground-truthed information on whether all occurrences recorded in recovery plans and in the California Natural Diversity Database continue to exist. These species include, but are not limited to, Colusa grass, Solano grass, San Joaquin adobe sunburst, Hartweg's golden sunburst and Bakersfield Cactus. In particular, those species for which 5-Year Reviews will be written in 2010 and do not have recent surveys should be the focus of status surveys. See list below for these species. The products for these surveys would be GIS maps showing location of surveys, a written description of the site (including discussion of any habitat conversion), and species status information including numbers of individuals, size of occupied area, reproductive status, habitat condition, and any observed threats. For imprecise historical records, a written description (including discussion of any habitat conversion) is needed and GIS maps of likely location of the record if the species are not found. A detailed discussion of survey methods and timing of surveys needs to be included for each species. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one tasks shown in the *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005).

Species which will be subject of 5-Year Reviews in 2010:

Alameda whipsnake (*Masticophis lateralis euryxanthus*)
California clapper rail (*Rallus longirostris obsoletus*)
California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*)
Giant garter snake (*Thamnophis gigas*)
Kern primrose sphinxmoth (*Euproserpinus euterpe*)
Riparian brush rabbit (*Sylvilagus bachmani riparius*)
Riparian wood rat (*Neotoma fuscipes riparia*)*

Brodiaea pallida (Chinese Camp brodiaea)*
Calyptridium pulchellum (Mariposa pussypaws)*
Clarkia springvillensis (Springville clarkia)*
Arctostaphylos pallida (Pallid manzanita)
Pseudobahia bahiifolia (Hartweg's golden sunburst)*
Pseudobahia peirsonii (San Joaquin adobe sunburst)*
Sidalcea keckii (Keck's checkermallow)*
Verbena californica (Red Hills vervain)*
* = species which have not been surveyed in 10 or more years at some locations.

7. *Determine the role and effects of livestock grazing on listed vernal pool species covered in the Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon (USFWS 2005)*. Most available information on the effects of grazing on vernal pool plants and animals is related to impacts to specific pest plant species or to the landscape (e.g., soil erosion or changes in hydrology) rather than to benefits to native species. Many listed vernal pool species receive some level of grazing; however, little information is available on optimum timing and intensity of grazing for individual species. For example, most occurrences of Sacramento Orcutt grass are not grazed and are competing with a variety of exotic, aggressive plants. Products for this research project should consist of an in-depth analysis of the effects of livestock grazing on listed vernal pool species and grazing recommendations for individual vernal pool species. The product of this study should include selection of the optimum type of grazer (cattle, horses, goats, etc.), timing of onset and offset of grazing, intensity of grazing (head per acre), and discussion of field indicators (e.g., biomass) to show when optimum level of grazing has been reached. Grazing recommendations should address target species (listed species and their competitors) and variations in habitat in wide-ranging species.

8. *Study effects of urbanization on California tiger salamander and California red-legged frog in the Fresno, California area.* The California tiger salamander and California red-legged frog continue to be threatened by urbanization of their habitat. For both species in Fresno County this is occurring at a rapid rate. Research into the effects of this urbanization would help consultants to design adequate compensation to minimize impacts to the species. The basic study design would be to examine salamander and/or frog population dynamics/demography and habitat use at a site that is about to be developed for urban uses and at a nearby control site that would not be developed. Protocol survey methods for both species could be used, as well as marked (radio tag) California tiger salamanders. At the experimental site, monitoring would begin 1-2 years prior to development and continue 3-5 years until construction had been completed. The control site would be sampled for the same number of years at the same time. Several potential salamander sites 1000-3000 acres in size exist at Millerton Lake.

9. *Giant Garter Snakes on the Cosumnes River Preserve. The project site is located in the Badger Creek subunit on the Cosumnes River Preserve*. The Badger Creek Subunit is located at the confluence of Badger Creek and the Cosumnes River, extending east to highway 99 between the Arno and Dillard Road interchanges. A large freshwater marsh complex (Snake Marsh) is located at the confluence of Badger Creek and Willow Creek, between the Cosumnes River and Highway 99. For this priority, the CVPCP and HRP are interested in proposals which have the main objective of determining why rapidly changing hydrologic and vegetative conditions on and adjacent to the Cosumnes River Preserve are occurring. The project goals include: (a) understanding how and why the habitat in Snake Marsh is changing by characterizing the vegetation and hydrology of the system; (b) determining whether the changes are adversely impacting the giant garter snake population in Snake Marsh; and (c) identifying management and restoration recommendations for this system. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks for the species found in the *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake* (USFWS 1999).

10. *Provide information on riparian woodrat distribution, demography and habitat requirements to further its recovery at San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge*. Relatively little is known about the endangered riparian woodrat (*Neotoma fuscipes riparia*), especially on the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge. Even its distribution is poorly understood. Considerable work has been implemented on the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge to further the recovery of riparian brush rabbits. However, the dearth of information regarding the riparian woodrat, which is often found in the same habitat as the riparian brush rabbit, in terms of its population status and habitat affinities, hampers the goal of working toward recovery of this species on the refuge and elsewhere. Basic information on distribution, abundance and habitat associations is sorely needed to better understand the phlylogeographic relationships of woodrat populations in the northern San Joaquin

Valley and to guide habitat restoration/management and species recovery. Information needed to guide management of the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge includes surveying and mapping of existing populations (on- and off-Refuge), population estimates, habitat definition, and existing habitat connectivity.

D. Other (Planning/Management/Outreach) Priorities

1. *Serpentine soil and associated habitats supporting endemic species, such as the bay checkerspot butterfly and serpentine plants, in Santa Clara County*. Proposals will be considered that emphasize outreach to landowners with serpentine habitat regarding pesticide use, grazing, and conservation easements. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for serpentine species found in the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a).

2. *Vernal pool habitats throughout the Central Valley supporting federally-listed vernal pool invertebrates, California tiger salamander, and listed plant species including slender Orcutt grass, Greene's tuctoria, Colusa grass, Hoover's spurge, and fleshy-owl's clover*. Actions will be considered that include the development of vernal pool management plans based on peer reviewed research findings. Proposals should emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks in Zones 1 and 2 Core Areas for vernal pool species found in the *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005).

3. *Developing and implementing outreach plans for the Pine Hill Preserve is a priority one task of the 2002 Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills (USFWS 2002c).* Preparation of new Preserve and Fire brochures and preparation and installation of Preserve signs along the boundaries of the Preserve are important outreach tools to inform the public of these protected conservation lands.

4. *Catalog conservation easements and other protected lands in the San Joaquin Valley using GIS.* Currently, information on lands in the San Joaquin Valley, California, that are protected through conservation easements, fee title, etc. is dispersed among many resource agencies, local governments, and private organizations including U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Land Management, California Department of Fish and Game, Center for Natural Lands Management, The Nature Conservancy, State of California Conservation Easements Registry, county and city governments, etc. Collating this information and making it available at a single location will help species planning and recovery in a variety of ways: a) this information will facilitate coordination of conservation actions between agencies, b) it will help agencies to avoid permitting development projects on land that is already protected, and c) when protected lands information is layered over species occurrence maps, areas in need of protection, as listed in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley*, including potential climate change refugia corridors, can be identified. Cataloging lands in the San Joaquin Valley will be the first phase of a project whose ultimate goal will be to catalog the protected lands throughout the state. The applicant will work with the proposed final repository holder of the data, the California Department of Fish and Game, to develop appropriate metadata and level of accuracy requirements. The product will be a GIS database with metadata that can be transferred to CDFG and the Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office and will incorporate the Service's requirements for any GIS-related contracts. Metadata should include protection type, landowner and easement holder contact information, species present, purpose of protection, endowment, management plan, and Service file number of mitigation- or compensation-related projects. The applicant will work with the GIS subteam of the San Joaquin Valley Recovery Team in development of the database.

LITERATURE CITED

The Nature Conservancy. 2006. The Global Invasive Species Initiative. Red Alert: *Glyceria declinata.* Invading Central Californian Vernal Pools.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1984. Revised Recovery Plan for Three Endangered Species Endemic to Antioch Dunes, California. Approved: March 21, 1980, and Revised: April 25, 1984. Portland, Oregon.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1984. Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Recovery Plan. Portland, Oregon. 62 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998a. Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area. Portland, Oregon. 330+ pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1998b. Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California. Portland, Oregon. 319 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999. Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake. Portland, Oregon. ix+ 192 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002a. Draft Recovery Plan for Chaparral and Scrub Community Species East of San Francisco Bay, California. Region 1, Portland, Oregon. xvi + 306 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002b. Recovery Plan for the California red-legged frog (*Rana aurora draytonii*). Portland, Oregon. viii + 173 pp.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002c. Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills. Portland, Oregon. xiii + 220 pp.

SECTION II -- AWARD INFORMATION

II.A. PROJECT FUNDING LIMITATIONS

The number of agreements awarded is dependent on the total amount of funding requested by successful proposals. Total estimated funding for the program for fiscal year 2009 is $3.2 million.

Reclamation and Service funds may range from $5,000 to $1,000,000 on approved projects.

II.B. RECLAMATION and SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES

If substantial involvement between Reclamation/Service and the Recipient is anticipated during the performance of this project, the anticipated instrument will be a cooperative agreement. In support of this agreement, Reclamation/Service will provide the following:

Reclamation/Service shall collaborate and participate with the Recipient in the management of the project and closely oversee the Recipient's activities to ensure that the program objectives are being achieved as per the cooperative agreement. This oversight shall include review, input, and approval at key interim stages of the project as identified in the Recipient's proposal.

If substantial involvement is not anticipated on the part of Reclamation/Service, the financial assistance instrument will be a grant.

Reclamation/Service retains the rights to make awards using either grants or cooperative agreements instruments.

The proposal must demonstrate public benefit for financial assistance agreements.

II.C. AWARD DATE

It is anticipated that awards will be made on or before **September 2009**.

SECTION III – ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

III.A. ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Applicants under this Funding Opportunity Announcement must be State or Local government agencies, private non-profit or profit organization, and individuals.

Federal agencies may apply to the Programs for project funding under the provisions of this FOA but are excluded from the granting process. Proposals submitted by Federal Agencies will be evaluated using criteria applied to other eligible applicants, however federal agency proposals selected for funding, will be exercised under separate interagency funding instruments.

III.B. COST SHARE GUIDELINES

There is no cost sharing requirement, but the level of partnering is considered during proposal evaluation. Refer to the ranking guidelines in Section V.A, "Evaluation and Ranking Criteria."

III.C. EVALUATION CRITERIA and WEIGHTING: Refer to Section V

III.D. Methods for Evaluating and Ranking Applications:

All applications are reviewed and ranked by a CVPCP & HRP Technical Team, comprised of State and Federal biologists and program managers. Technical Team members utilize ranking criteria described in Section V.A to determine which proposals should be selected for funding. Selected applications are also approved by Reclamation and Service Management staff.

III.E. Submission Deadline and Location for Submission:
Submission deadline is November 14, 2008. Application should be sent to Maria E. Castaneda, MP-3813, 2800 Cottage Way, Room E-1815, Sacramento, CA 95825-1898.

III.F. OTHER REQUIREMENTS

III.F.1 SF 424 (COVER PAGE) AND ASSURANCES

The applicant must submit these required forms in accordance with the requirements stated in Section IV of this document.

III.F.2 PROJECT AND BUDGET PROPOSALS

The applicant must submit project and budget proposals in accordance with the requirements stated in Section IV of this document.

III.F.3 OTHER REGULATIONS

Applicants shall adhere to Federal, California, and local laws, regulations, and codes, as applicable, and shall obtain all required approvals and permits. Applicants shall also coordinate and obtain approvals from site owners and operators. See Section IV.C.2.9 for additional information regarding environmental and regulatory compliance.

SECTION IV – APPLICATION AND PROPOSAL SUBMISSION INFORMATION

IV.A. AGENCY CONTACT

IV.A.1. Interested organizations or individuals are requested to submit their questions pertaining to this FOA to the Grants Officer by:

E-mail: mcastaneda@mp.usbr.gov

Mail:
Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region
Attn: Maria E. Castaneda
2800 Cottage Way, MP-3813
Sacramento CA 95825-1898

RECLAMATION:

Mr. John Thomson/MP-152
CVP Conservation Program/HRP Manager
Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento CA 95825-1898
(916) 978-5052
Email: jthomson@mp.usbr.gov

SERVICE:

Ms. Caroline Prose/ HRP Manager
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
California and Nevada Regional Office
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento CA 95825
(916) 414-6575
email: caroline_prose@fws.gov

I.V.A.2. Interested organizations or individuals having difficulties accessing forms/electronic addresses, or have questions pertaining to the Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, may contact Maria E. Castaneda at (916) 978-5148.

IV.B. INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF PROJECT PROPOSAL

Submit one original and three copies. Each applicant shall submit proposals in accordance with the instructions contained in this section. Detailed instructions for each of these elements are set forth immediately below.

Applications must be submitted as a complete package. Materials arriving separately will not be included in the application package for consideration and will result in the application being rejected or not funded. Mailing materials, package, or packing envelopes of the proposal must reference the **FOA number 09SF200001**. **FAX copies of proposal documents will not be accepted.**

Do not include a cover letter or company literature/brochure with your proposal. All pertinent information must be included in your Project and Project Budget Proposals in accordance with the formats described below.

Proposals shall be submitted in hard copy only and addressed as follows (electronic or facsimile transmissions of proposals will NOT be accepted):

Mailing Address:

Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region
Attn: Maria E. Castaneda, MP-3813
2800 Cottage Way, Room E-1815
Sacramento CA 95825-1898

IV.B.2. DATE FOR RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS

Proposals will be accepted until 3:00 p.m., Pacific Standard Time, on November 14, 2008. Proposals received after this date and time will not be considered for award.

IV.C. PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS

IV.C.1 Cover Page – The cover page shall consist of a fully completed SF 424 - Application for Federal Assistance. This form must be signed by a person legally authorized to commit your organization to performance of the activity. **Inclusion of a properly signed SF 424 in your proposal is a mandatory requirement. Failure to adhere to this requirement will result in the elimination of your proposal from further consideration**. **This form may be downloaded from www.Grants.gov under the Funding Opportunity 09SF200001, Full Announcement or Application.**

IV.C.2 Assurances **–** Include with your proposal a completed and signed SF 424B – Assurances – Non-Construction Programs or an SF 424D – Assurances – Construction Programs. This form must be signed by a person legally authorized to commit your organization to performance of the activity. **Inclusion of a properly signed SF 424B or SF 424D in your proposal is a mandatory requirement. Failure to adhere to this requirement will result in the elimination of your proposal from further consideration. These forms may be downloaded from www.grants.gov under the Funding Opportunity, 09SF200001, Full Announcement or Application.**

IV.C.3 Written Project Proposal

- Shown below is the proposal format which all applicants must adhere to when submitting a project proposal.
- All proposals must have a page number on every page.

- All proposals will be evaluated for their technical merit and completeness. Applications should submit well described and technically accurate proposal packages organized in the below format.

Format:

I. Title of Project (*state the title of the project)*

II. Abstract *(submit a brief abstract in standard abstract format)*

III. Proposal Category (*list the proposal category, e.g., Acquisition, Restoration, Research, or "Other" such as Planning, Management or Outreach)*

IV. Project Objective *(clearly state what objectives the project hopes to achieve when implemented)*

V. Project Proponent *(provide name, address, phone number, fax number, and email address of contact person)*

VI. Location of Project *(include a detailed legal description - Township, Range Meridian, Section - of the project location, including size of project area, along with a map indicating local reference points. Also include photographs of the project site, if applicable.)*

VII. Amount of Funding Request *(specify funds requested from the CVPCP/HRP)*

VIII. Total Project Cost *(specify total estimated cost of the project)*

IX. Proposed Activities *(provide a detailed description of the action being proposed for funding; include any relevant background information, such as surrounding land-uses, etc… If the proposal is for acquisition or restoration, state the type of habitat and the number of acres that would be acquired or restored if funded. Additionally, provide enough information about potential effects from the project, so that the impact analysis can be facilitated and the compliance requirements can be satisfied. Examples of questions that may need to be answered are: What are the dimensions of the area to be disturbed? Where will fill be obtained? Where will soil be dumped? Will you be moving dirt to a relatively undisturbed area? etc. Provide written descriptions and figures as necessary).*

X. Project Timeline *(include milestones and final completion date for each tasks)*

XI. Existing Habitat and Species Baseline Conditions *(describe habitat conditions and species occurrences on the project site. Include citations of biological surveys that can verify these conditions and occurrences. Conditions should be described for Federal, State, proposed, and candidate species, and Species of Special Concern).*

XII. Measuring Results (*describe how the results of the project would be measured when implemented. Examples of project results that could be measured are monitoring, species survival, increases in baseline conditions, etc.)*

XIII. Curriculum vitae and/or resume *(provide a curriculum vitae and/or resume for each person who would be significantly involved in the project)*.

XIV. Relationship to Program Ranking Criteria

a. Describe how the proposal will address the following, if applicable:

1. Eligibility to Rank *(to be determined by Program Managers and ranking team. Refer to description of criteria for more information*)

2. CVP Nexus *(indicate the proposal's relationship to the CVP)*

3. Program Priority *(per the current year priorities for the programs specified in the FOA on www.Grants.gov, state which priority(ies) the proposal addresses, and describe how the project relates to the priority(ies)).*

4. Federally Listed Species (includes species Proposed for listing) *(indicate in as much detail as possible how the project will benefit these species, and how many species will benefit. Define and document existing baseline conditions related to Federally listed species and cite all documented references of species occurrence (i.e., results of species surveys at the project area, reports in the California Department of Fish and Game's Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) that document the presence of a species at or near the proposed project site, written statements by State and/or Federal biologists having personal knowledge that a species is present at the proposed site). Provide table listing these species and their status* ***[see example in Attachment A]****. Also describe whether the proposed action will address species' recovery plan tasks, and state whether designated "critical habitat" is part of the project)*

5. State Listed Species *(indicate how State listed species, including Rare species, may benefit from the project. Apply same provisions as indicated for Federal species and include in species table…* ***see Attachment A****)*

6. Target Species *(describe how Candidate Species, Species of Special Concern, and CNPS species may benefit from the project. Apply same provisions as indicated for Federal species and include in species table …****see Attachment A****)*

7. Habitat/Bio-Diversity *(describe cover types and species diversity within the project area, and how the project will help maintain or benefit these components)*

8. Cumulative Benefit *(indicate how the project relates to the collective influence of other on-going or planned activities related to the same species or habitats)*

9. Long-term Benefit *(address how the project benefits might persist or increase over time)*

10. Project Site Connectivity *(describe how the project is physically connected to another protected or restored parcel)*

11. Partners *(indicate amount of contributions, funds or in-kind services, from partners in relation to the overall cost of the project. Also specify whether funds being requested are also being requested simultaneously from other sources)*

12. CVP Impacts *(address to what extent a species or habitat was impacted by the CVP).*

13. Project Urgency *(assign a scale of urgency to the action based on the endangerment of a species or the level of threat to a habitat area)*

XV. Budget *(Provide a detailed budget summary that indicates annual costs by tasks and funding category, include cost share partners. Instructions for budget submittal is found in* ***Section IV.D***

Attachment A
Example of Species Table

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status[a]	State Status[b]	CNPS Status[c]	Species Verified Presence (Y/N)
Plants **Palmate-bracted bird's beak[d]**	***Cordylanthus palmatus***	**E**	**E**	**1B**	
Hairy orcutt grass[d]	***Orcuttia pilosa***	**E**	**E**	**1B**	
Greene's tuctoria[d]	***Tuctoria greenei***	**E**	**R**	**1B**	
Hoover's spurge[d]	***Chamaesyce hooveri***	**T**		**1B**	
Vernal pool saltbush[e]	***Atriplex persistens***			**1B**	
Heartscale[e]	***Atriplex cordulata***			**1B**	
Brittlescale[e]	***Atriplex depressa***			**1B**	
San Joaquin spearscale[d]	***Atriplex joaquiniana***			**1B**	
Ferris' milk vetch[d]	***Astragulas tener* var. *ferrisiae***			**1B**	
Heckard's pepper-grass[e]	***Lepidium latipes* var. *heckardii***			**1B**	
Invertebrates **Vernal pool tadpole shrimp[e]**	***Lepidurus packardi***	**E**			
Conservancy fairy shrimp[d]	***Branchinecta conservatio***	**E**			
Vernal pool fairy shrimp[d]	***Branchinecta lynchi***	**T**			
Reptiles **Giant garter snake[e]**	***Thamnophis gigas***	**T**	**T**		
Western pond turtle[e]	***Clemmys marmorata***	**FSC**	**CSC**		
Birds **Bald eagle[e]**	***Haliaeetus leucocephalus***	**T**	**E**		
Swainson's hawk[e]	***Buteo swainsoni***	**FSC**	**T**		
White-tailed kite[e]	***Elanus leucurus***	**FSC**			
Burrowing owl[e]	***Athene cunicularia***	**FSC**	**CSC**		
White-faced ibis[e]	***Plegadis chihi***	**FSC**	**CSC**		
Long-billed curlew[e]	***Numenius americanus***	**FSC**	**CSC**		
Loggerhead shrike[e]	***Lanius ludovicianus***	**FSC**	**CSC**		
Tricolored blackbird[e]	***Agelaius tricolor***	**FSC**	**CSC**		
Northern harrier[e]	***Circus cyaneus***		**CSC**		
Short-eared owl[e]	***Asio flammeus***		**CSC**		
California horned lark[e]	***Eremophila alpestris actia***		**CSC**		

[a]E = federally listed as endangered, T= federally listed as threatened, FSC = federal species of concern.
[b]E = state listed as endangered, R = state listed as rare, T = state listed as threatened, CSC = California special concern species.
[c]1B = rare, threatened, or endangered in California and elsewhere.
[d]Present near Tracts G and H.
[e]Present on Tracts G and H.

IV.C.4 Consistency with State or Local Water Plan – **(If applicable)** Applicants are required to ensure that the proposed project is consistent with any existing local (i.e. county, municipal or regional) water plan, or with the Bureau of Reclamation criteria for evaluating water management plans available on line at http://www.usbr.gov/mp/watershare/documents.html#criteria.

IV.C.5 Environmental and Regulatory Compliance – Applicants are required to comply with all applicable state, Federal, and local environmental, cultural, and paleontological resource protection laws and regulations. These may include, but are not limited to, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), including the Council on Environmental Quality and Department of the Interior regulations implementing NEPA, the Clean Water Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, the Endangered Species Act, and could require consultation with potentially affected Tribes.

Reclamation and the Service are the lead Federal agencies for NEPA compliance. As the lead agencies, they are responsible for determining the appropriate level of NEPA compliance, which could be a categorical exclusions checklist, environmental assessment, or environmental impact statement. However, a project proponent (or their contractor) should provide much of the necessary information and data analyses in order for the agencies to complete NEPA and other regulatory compliance. This information may include specifics about site disturbance, presence of listed species, archeological sites, past or on-going surveys, etc.…

In addition, applicants must obtain all required approvals and permits, and shall coordinate and obtain any approvals required from site owners and operators. Applicants should state in their proposals whether any permits or approvals are required, and explain the applicant's plan for obtaining such permits or approvals.

Environmental and regulatory compliance costs are addressed in Section IV.D.2.7.

IV.D. BUDGET PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

IV.D.1. General Requirements

Include a budget with the estimated costs to conduct the proposed activity. The budget should include the sources and values of in-kind contributions of goods and services as well as funds provided to complete the activity (i.e. include the total cost of the activity, and not just the requested funds).

In addition to the below-described budget format, the applicant must complete an SF 424A, Budget Information – Non-construction Programs, or an SF 424C, Budget Information, Construction Programs. These forms may be downloaded from www.grants.gov under the Funding Opportunity, 09SF200001, Full Announcement or Application

IV.D.2. Budget Narrative Proposal Format

The activity budget should include sufficient **detailed** information to enable us to evaluate the reasonableness of the budgeted amount. Listed below are additional instructions for some budget categories frequently encountered. Not all proposals will have costs in each category. The classification of costs into the various categories is not essential. These categories are provided simply as a means to provide instructions regarding the type of information to submit with the budget. If the activity budget includes expenses in these categories, follow the instructions provided. If the activity budget includes expenses in "Other" category, provide information that describes how the budget amount was estimated, what assumptions it is based upon, etc. **In all cases, sufficient information must be provided to allow a determination that the budget is fair and reasonable for the proposed activity. Award will not be made to any applicant who fails to fully disclose the following information**. See Sample Budget Form on Page 23.

IV.D.2.1 Salaries and Wages – Identify the personnel, by title, who will conduct the proposed activity. For all identified positions, indicate the salaries and wages, estimated hours or percent of time in conducting the activity, and the rate of compensation proposed. All labor estimates, including any proposed subcontractors,

shall be allocated to specific tasks as outlined in the Applicant's technical proposal. Labor rates and proposed hours shall be displayed for each task.

Generally, salaries of administrative and/or clerical personnel should be included as a portion of your indirect costs. If these salaries can be adequately documented as direct costs, they may be included in this section; however, an explanation should be included in your budget narrative.

IV.D.2.2 Fringe Benefits – Indicate the rate or amount estimated for fringe benefits, and the items that are included in this category, and the basis of the rate computations. Indicate whether these rates are used for proposal purposes only or whether they are fixed or provisional rates for billing purposes. Federally-approved rate agreements are acceptable for compliance with this item.

IV.D.2.3 Travel – Include the purpose of the trip, destination, number traveling, length of stay, and all travel costs, including air fare, per diem, lodging, and miscellaneous travel expenses. For local travel, include the number of miles and rate per mile.

IV.D.2.4 Equipment – Identify the type of equipment to be used, hourly rate (but include the wages for the operator, if any, in the Salaries and Wages category), and estimated number of hours. Include information as to the need for this equipment.

IV.D.2.5 Material and Supplies – Itemize material and supplies by major category and purpose, such as office, research, or construction. When possible, identify the unit price and quantity.

IV.D.2.6 Contractual – Identify all work that will be accomplished by subrecipients or consultants, including detailed budget estimate of time, rates, supplies, and materials that will be required for the task. If a subrecipient or consultant is proposed and approved at the time of award, no other approvals are necessary. Any changes or additions to the approved plan will require a request for approval.

IV.D.2.7 Environmental and Regulatory Compliance Costs – Reference cost incurred by Reclamation or the applicant in complying with environmental regulations applicable to the CVPCP/HRP, which include NEPA, ESA, NHPA and the Clean Water Act, and other regulations depending on the project, including costs associated with any required permits or approvals.

IV.D.2.8 Other – Any other expense not included in the categories above, shall be listed in this category, along with a description of the item and for what it will be utilized. Provide the basis for the estimated cost, assumptions used in the estimate, etc.

IV.D.2.9 Profit – **No** profit or fee will be allowed.

IV.D.2.10. Indirect Cost - Show the proposed rate, cost base, and proposed amount for allowable indirect costs based on the applicable OMB circular cost principles for the Applicant's organization. It is not acceptable to simply incorporate indirect rates within other direct cost line items.

IV.D.2.11 Total Cost – Indicate the total amount of the budget, including Federal and non-Federal amounts.

Sample Budget Form

COST ITEM DESCRIPTION	COMPUTATION		RECIPIENT COST SHARE	RECLAMATION FUNDING	TOTAL COST
	Unit/Hr	Quantity			
SALARIES AND WAGES					
Employee 1					
Employee 2					
FRINGE BENEFITS					
Full-time employees					
Part-time employees					
TRAVEL					
Trip 1					
Trip 2					
EQUIPMENT					
Item A					
Item B					
Item C					
SUPPLIES/MATERIALS					
Office Supplies					
Construction					
CONTRACTUAL					
ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE					
OTHER					
Reporting					
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS					
INDIRECT COSTS - __%					
TOTAL ACTIVITY COSTS			$	$	$

Sources of Funding

Recipient
Cash: _____
In-Kind Services: _____
Partner (1) _____
Cash: _____
In-Kind Services: _____
Partner (2) _____
Cash: _____
In-Kind Services: _____
Reclamation: _____
Total Activity Funding: _____

SECTION V -- APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

V.A. EVALUATION AND RANKING CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated by a technical panel in accordance with the criteria listed below. These evaluation criteria are considered to be equal in importance. Applications can gain a total of 100 points

V.A.1 EVALUATION CRITERIA

Eligibility to Rank Y = yes

N = no

CVP Nexus: Y = yes
N = no

Program Priority: Point # in accordance with priorities within each funding category

Federally Listed (includes Proposed for Listing) Species Benefits:

0 = Project would result in no benefits to federally listed/proposed species
1-2 = Project would result in **minimal** benefits to federally listed/proposed species
3-4 = Project would result in **moderate** benefits to federally listed/proposed species
5-6 = Project would result in **major** benefits to federally listed/proposed species

State (includes Rare) Listed Species

0 = Project would result in no benefits to State listed species
1 = Project would result in **minimal** benefits to State listed species
2 = Project would result in **moderate** benefits to State listed Species
3 = Project would result in **major** benefits to State listed species

Target Species: 0 = Project would result in no benefits to Target species
1 = Project would result in **minimal** benefits to Target species
2 = Project would result in **moderate** benefits to Target species
3 = Project would result in **major** benefits to Target species

Habitats/Biodiversity: 0 = none
1-2 = low
3-4= medium
4-6= high

Cumulative Benefit: 0 = none
1 = low
2 = medium
3 = high

Long-term Benefit:
0 = none
1 = low
2 = medium
3 = high

Project Site Connectivity:
0 = none
1 = low
2 = medium
3 = high

Partners:
0 = Other partners bear 0% of the total cost
1 = Other partners bear 1-10% of the total cost
2 = Other partners bear 11-20% of the total cost
3 = Other partners bear 21-30% of the total cost
4 = Other partners bear 31-40% of the total cost
5 = Other partners bear 41-50% of the total cost
6 = Other partners bear 51% or greater of the total cost

Level of CVP Impacts:
0 = none
2 = low
4 = medium
6 = high

Project Urgency:
0 = none
3 = low
6 = medium
9 = high

Technical Merit and Completeness of Proposal:

0 = none
1= low
2= medium
3= high

Acres: For informational purposes only

Program Cost: For informational purposes only

Total cost: For informational purposes only

Total Points Sum of all applicable criteria by project type

V.A.2 DESCRIPTION OF RANKING CRITERIA

I. <u>Introduction</u>

This document provides a brief description and explanation of funding guidelines and ranking criteria used during evaluation of proposals being considered for funding by the CVPCP and the HRP. Proposals are considered under a single evaluation process for both Programs.

These priorities and criteria grew out of several of the Service's and Reclamation's programs that

began planning work and implementing the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA) prior to 1995. They include the concerns and priorities that have developed from the implementation of the Friant Biological Opinion in 1992, and Biological Opinions related to CVP contract renewals and Reclamation's Operation Criteria and Plan (OCAP). They further reflect the concerns that have been communicated to the CVPCP & HRP's Technical Team by the management of the offices of the Fish and Wildlife Service (Endangered Species Division), Bureau of Reclamation, and California Department of Fish and Game.

II. General Considerations

The description of guidelines and criteria presented in this write-up are implemented in the context of general considerations of the CVPCP & HRP Technical Team and Program Managers, which can influence final decisions regarding funding. These considerations include:

1) Proposals are grouped into four categories. These categories reflect the Programs' emphasis on certain kinds of activities considered more effective and critical to species' protection and recovery than others. Accordingly, program funds are applied to proposals in the following order of priority (however, fee title/easement acquisition and habitat restoration projects have equal priorities):

(A) Fee Title/Easement Acquisition: Protection of species or existing habitats impacted by the CVP through the purchase of fee title or conservation easements.

(B) Habitat Restoration: Restoration or enhancement of species or existing habitats impacted by the CVP through restoration of CVP-impacted habitats.

(C) Research: Research addressing status, habitat needs, and behavior of CVP-impacted species.

(D) Outreach/Planning/Other: Public outreach and education, formulation of land management plans, and other activities.

2) Actions funded by the CVPCP/HRP are opportunity driven. Funding decisions are often dependent on the number and scope of proposals received in given year.

3) The past performance of an applicant is considered during project selection. Poor performance during implementation of past grant agreements might weigh against further funding.

4) Project feasibility is considered during proposal selection. Program managers conclude whether a project will result in real benefits to species in a cost-effective manner before making funding decisions.

III. Proposal Ranking Criteria

Proposals received by the CVPCP and HRP are placed into the four project categories specified in Section II. Some or all of the criteria described below are applied to those categories, but no other criteria, other than those listed below, are used.

(A) LAND ACQUISITION (Easement and/or Fee Title) PROJECTS

Eligibility to Rank

This criterion considers whether or not the proposal merits ranking. The CVPCP & HRP Technical Team will determine this by considering the following: 1) compliance with the terms and conditions of the RFA, and 2) past performance of the project applicant in cases where the applicant has received grant funding in the past from the CVPCP/HRP or other programs, and their performance related to this funding is measurable. Specifically, for compliance with the terms and conditions of the RFA, we will consider whether or not the proposal meets the goals and objectives of the CVPCP and HRP, *etc*. For past performance, we will consider how well the project applicant, as a previous grant recipient, complied with submitting invoices, reports, and other requested information (*e.g*., Appraisal Report, Recorded Grant Deed, Title Report, Closing Statement) for previous projects in a complete and timely manner; communicated and coordinated on past projects between themselves and the granting agency(ies); complied with the terms and conditions of the previous contract; was responsive to requested information; *etc.*

CVP Nexus

The criterion considers whether a "nexus" exists between the project proposal and the CVP. Generally a nexus is determined based on two factors:

1) Will benefits to a CVP-affected species or resource occur within a CVP contract service area, or in an area where CVP water is delivered following water transfer of sale?

2) Is there a strong linkage between an affected habitat and/or species (i.e., vernal pools) and the CVP? This would allow, in some cases, for a project area to exist outside a CVP Service Area as long this linkage between habitat and/or species exists.

This factor is valuable to Reclamation because it provides a higher level of assurance to water users that the conservation needs of resources affected by their district are being addressed in proportion to their share in water surcharge contributions, and thereby serving to make future formal Section 7 consultations easier for actions needed in their district.

It is important to bear in mind that opportunities to most cost-effectively recover a species may not all be found within water districts, but, at the same time, there are recovery actions specifically identified within the CVP service area that should get preference when there are willing sellers or the conditions necessary to move forward are otherwise suitable for implementation of such tasks, and other considerations are equally beneficial to the resource.

Program Priority

This criterion addresses a proposal's relationship to the annual priorities of the CVPCP/HRP, in terms of habitats, species and geographic area identified and ranked for a given year. Each year the Programs establish these priorities based on past expenditures and existing needs. A proposal that addresses needs within these priorities will be ranked accordingly, with proposals in higher priority categories receiving more points than those in lower priority areas. Priorities are indicated in the Programs' Funding Opportunity Announcement on www.Grants.gov

Federally Listed Species Benefits

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have specific benefits to species that are currently Federally listed, as opposed to proposals with broader ecological benefits. **Under this criterion, species that are designated as "Proposed" for Federal listing are given the same status as those currently listed.**

The criterion asks the following question: Does the proposal provide a major, moderate, or minimal benefit to Federally listed species that have been impacted by the CVP?

While considering this criterion, the Programs' Technical Team will consult existing Recovery Plans to determine whether an action within a proposal can be correlated with Recovery Plan tasks. This correlation can be used as a tool for determining the scale of benefit that would result from implementation of the proposal.

Additionally, when determining this ranking, reviewers keep in mind that immediacy of threat to a species and the degree of urgency associated with a project, is considered under a separate criteria ("Project Urgency.")

General guidance and examples of major, moderate, and minimal benefits are as follows:

For fee title and easement acquisitions, a **major** benefit to Federally listed species would result when the land that is acquired consists of the following attributes: Land is in relatively pristine condition and does not need to be restored (e.g., has not been previously degraded or contaminated by previous land uses and is not dominated by exotic species); land is utilized by numerous Federally listed species; land is comprised of designated critical habitat; and land is not subject to disturbance from adjacent lands (e.g., noise from developed areas, agricultural activities, etc.).

A **moderate** benefit to Federally listed species would result when the land that is acquired consists of the following attributes: Land is not in pristine condition, needs little restoration, and has not been severely degraded; land is utilized by a moderate number of Federally listed species; land may or may not be comprised of designated critical habitat; and land is subject to minimal to very moderate disturbance from adjacent lands.

A **minimal** benefit to Federally listed species would result when the land that is acquired consists of the following attributes: Land is not pristine and needs moderate to major restoration to address degradation; land is utilized by very few Federally listed species; land is not comprised of designated critical habitat; and land is subject to moderate to high disturbance from adjacent lands.

State Listed Species

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have benefits to State listed species (including "Rare" designation), in addition to any other kind of ecological benefit. Guidance for "Federally Listed Species Benefits" is used to rank this criterion.

Target Species Benefits

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have benefits to other species besides those that are Federally listed (or Proposed for listing). These include: Federally designated Candidate species, Federally and State designated Species of Special Concern, and CNPS species. Guidance for "Federally Listed Species Benefits" is used to rank this criterion.

Habitat/Bio-Diversity

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have benefits to ecosystems that currently support a habitat matrix composed of habitat components that complement each other. These components increase their value in conserving native species beyond what each habitat would do separately, as opposed to projects that would not have that kind of benefit. For example, an acquisition project directed at protecting a variety of vegetative cover types, would receive a higher

ranking than one that is focused on one in particular. This criterion is also used to distinguish between projects that have benefits to ecosystems that currently support a large proportion of the native species expected in the habitats to be benefited, particularly in habitats that have greatly declined elsewhere, in addition to other kinds of ecological benefit. It relates to the array of native species on the proposal's project site, and is not limited to listed species. It can apply to proposals that would protect a diverse area and/or increase diversity through restoration. **The key question here is: "Will the proposal benefit or maintain a broad range of native species and habitats, or is it directed at just a few?"** This ranking criterion is not applicable to Study/Survey proposals, since these projects tend to focus on specific habitats related to a particular species.

Cumulative Benefit

This criterion considers a project's impact on species/habitats in relation to the collective influence of other on-going or planned activities related to those species and habitats.

An example of a **major** benefit would be a land acquisition project that is part of a larger strategy for a species recovery, such as providing habitat for a species' reintroduction or research. An example of a **moderate** benefit would be one in which changes in land use (e.g. grazing), resulting from the acquisition, would provide moderate benefits for listed species. Another might be one in which some modest, but not comprehensive, restoration work occurs over a number of years. A proposal with **minimal** cumulative benefits would be one in which the proposed action is isolated from other conservation activities, such as a land acquisition in which no restoration or research is planned and the property is not located in areas critical to meeting the species needs (i.e., habitat used incidentally for foraging).

Long-term Benefit

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have benefits that are expected to continue in perpetuity, as opposed to projects that address an immediate problem, but will become superfluous to the conservation of Central Valley ecosystems and native species due to later projects and conservation measures.

An example of a **major** benefit would be a project in which the property would be preserved intact and in perpetuity, and where the protected properties have "potential" for supporting additional species. An example of a **moderate to minimal** ranking might be a project in which properties may still be influenced directly or indirectly by future development.

Project Site Connectivity

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have synergistic benefits because they benefit habitats that are in proximity to other protected areas, rather than those that are isolated and diminished in value because of that isolation. This criterion applies only to the Acquisition and Restoration categories since these projects relate to actual project sites and locations. This criterion is related to "Cumulative Benefit" but is specific to project location, and does not consider other collective influences on the project's overall impact and effectiveness.

A **major** benefit would result when a project is contiguous to other protected lands and would contribute to securing needed corridors or spatial requirements of species. A **moderate** benefit would result when properties are nearby, but these properties do not represent a continuous band of protected lands. A **minimal** benefit would result if the project property is isolated from other conservation lands.

Partners

This criterion distinguishes projects where there will be contributions of cash or in-kind services toward the total cost of the project. Project proponents must specify the following in their proposals: (1) specific partners (other than CVPCP/HRP), and (2) specific funding amounts (as a percentage of total cost) from those partners. This information must be provided in order for partnering levels to be ascertained and counted. Unfunded costs of the project (other than that requested from the CVPCP/HRP) will not be considered as a level of partnering unless the above information is specified. Project applicants are also required to equate in-kind services to dollars, or these services will not be considered when partnering levels are being tallied. This criterion does allow for past contributions to the overall objective of a project. For example, if a proposal seeks funds for the last phase (i.e., maintenance) of a riparian restoration project, funding of earlier phases would be counted when determining partnering levels. It should also be noted that failure to secure funds from other specified sources may jeopardize delivery of funds under a CVPCP/HRP grant agreement.

It is highly encouraged that project applicants seek other sources of funding along with funding from the CVPCP and/or HRP.

Level of CVP Impacts

This criterion measures and assesses to what extent a species or ecosystem has been affected by the Central Valley Project. It includes direct, indirect, interdependent, and interrelated effects. Species and habitats more affected by the CVP than others will be given more points. The criteria works in conjunction with the “Program Priorities” section but is ranked separately since priorities are also based on level of past expenditures. The Technical Team will evaluate whether the species/habitats benefited by the proposed project have been identified as “high” impact, “medium” impact and “low” impact as related to construction and operation of the CVP. Projects that would rank high for CVP impacts would be those that include habitat types and their associated species that have been the most directly and significantly impacted by the CVP.

The Technical Team will use historical data as a general guide when discussing this criteria, but will consider project location (physical connection to CVP facilities and place of use) in relation to the CVP when determining a final ranking. For example, a riparian restoration project on the perimeter of the CVPCP/HRP project area may not get as high a ranking as one directly adjacent to a CVP facility or within a CVP Service area, even though riparian habitats were significantly impacted by the CVP.

Considering these factors, therefore, proposals will be given a **major** rating if species/habitats being addressed within a project area have been significantly impacted by the CVP, and the project site is within a CVP Service Area or historical place of use. A proposal would receive a **moderate** rating if significantly impacted species are outside a CVP Service Area or historical place of us. Proposals addressing species/habitats not significantly affected by the CVP and on a project site outside a CVP use area, would receive a **minimal** rating.

Project Urgency

The purpose of this criterion is to evaluate and assign a scale of urgency to an action, based on: 1) the level of endangerment of a species addressed in a proposal and 2) the resulting threat to species should the action not be carried out. During proposal evaluation, the Technical Team will ask the question “How badly do we need to do this project?” in the context of the overall goals of the CVPCP and HRP.

Examples of a proposal receiving a **major** ranking might be a land acquisition in which the parcel in question supports Federally listed, CVP-impacted species but is under the immediate threat of

development; or a proposal in which an action (in either of the four categories) addresses the needs of a species threatened with extinction (critically endangered) unless effective recovery actions (contained in the proposal) are not carried out.

Technical Merit and Completeness of Proposal

Proposals should be well described and will be ranked for completeness and technical accuracy. The Technical Team will consider how well the objectives and methods are explained; whether backup documentation is complete and detailed; quality of maps and tables; how well the proposal addresses the ranking criteria; and how well the proposal package adhered to the required format. In addition to being reviewed and ranked by the CVPCP & HRP Technical Team, research proposals will also be forwarded to scientific experts in the various fields of research topics, species, and/or habitats so that they can be reviewed for technical accuracy.

Acres

No ranking is applied. This criterion specifies amount of acres applicable to a proposed acquisition or restoration project.

CP/HRP Cost

No ranking is applied to this criterion, but the information is used to evaluate the relative amount of cost-share contributions to be provided by partners.

Total Cost

No ranking is applied to this criterion, but the information is used to evaluate the relative amount of cost-share contributions to be provided by partners.

Total Points

This sums all points received for a particular proposal in a particular category. Total points are evaluated in the context of General Considerations, as specified in Section II.

(B) RESTORATION PROJECTS

Eligibility to Rank

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

CVP Nexus

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Program Priority

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Federally Listed Species Benefits

For restoration projects, a **major** benefit would result when the reviewers determine that the restoration action has the potential to markedly raise baseline for one or more Federally listed, CVP-impacted species. Examples include creating new and substantial areas of giant garter snake or California red-legged frog habitat in areas that will be readily colonized by the species, or a captive

breeding (riparian brush rabbit) or a seed banking program, etc. A **moderate** benefit may be a general habitat restoration project that has some real but not significant benefits to listed species due to the scale and size of the restoration component focused on Federally listed species; an example might be a project in which new permanent water areas for garter snake are created, but the additional habitat is considered only a moderate increase due to other limiting factors on the project site. A project with **minimal** benefits might be a restoration project where there are only ancillary benefits to one or more Federally listed species, and these benefits are not the main intent of the restoration project (i.e., a wetland restoration project in which minimal/marginal garter snake habitat is created while mainly enhancing conditions for waterfowl, or a riparian project where elderberries will be planted but in areas and at certain densities where it is unlikely to result in VELB colonization).

State Listed Species

Use guidance for "Federally Listed Species Benefits" in this category to rank this criterion.

Target Species Benefits

Use guidance for "Federally Listed Species Benefits" in this category to rank this criterion.

Habitat/Bio-Diversity

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Cumulative Benefit

An example of projects with **major** cumulative values would be a restoration project that is part of a larger strategy for a species recovery, such as providing habitat for a species' reintroduction or research. An example of a **moderate** benefit might be a fencing project done in conjunction with other land management activities designed to improve conditions for species unless a proposal clearly identified a major benefit through such action. A proposal with **minimal** cumulative benefits would be one in which the proposed action is isolated from other conservation activities, such as a restoration project that is not located in an area critical to meeting the species needs (i.e., habitat used incidentally for foraging).

Long-term Benefit
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Project Site Connectivity
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Partners
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Level of CVP Impacts
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Project Urgency
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Technical Merit and Completeness of Proposal
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion

Acres
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

CP/HRP Cost
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Total Cost
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Total Points
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

(C) RESEARCH

Eligibility to Rank

For this category, a submitted proposal will not be ranked if it does not target at least one of the program's research priorities for the fiscal year as specified in the RFA. Studies and surveys are considered action specific, therefore only proposals that address specified actions in the RFA will be considered for ranking.

The additional Eligibility to Rank criterion described under Acquisition Projects also applies to Study/Survey proposals.

CVP Nexus
Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Federally Listed Species Benefits

For study and survey proposals, a **major** benefit would result if the Technical Team determines that the proposed work provides data that contributes significantly to a species recovery, such as a genetic or behavioral study in which data is used for Federally listed species reintroduction, a survey or study that results in changes in the listing status of a species, or a survey where additional populations of individuals are identified where they were once believed to be extirpated. A **moderate** benefit could result if a study or survey provides moderately useful information contributing to recovery, such as new baseline information regarding a species status or distribution. A project with **minimal** benefits would be one in which data obtained might only supplement a large body of preexisting information about a species.

State Listed Species

Use guidance for "Federally Listed Species Benefits" in this category to rank this criterion.

Target Species Benefits

Use guidance for "Federally Listed Species Benefits" in this category to rank this criterion.

Cumulative Benefit

An example of a project with **major** cumulative values would be a study/survey that works in concert with other on-going research directed at a particular species, such as genetics study on California red-legged frog that may provide important information related to reintroducing the species into certain locations. An example of a **moderate** benefit might be a species survey that supplements

and enhances relatively current information but does not provide new information considered critical to a species' recovery (e.g. presence or absence of species on newly restored riparian areas). A proposal with **minimal** cumulative benefits would be a project such as a species' inventory in an area generally not seen as an important geographic area for the species and has, therefore, not been emphasized in previous work (e.g. CA red-legged frog surveys in watersheds where frog populations are assumed not to exist).

Long-term Benefit

An example of a **major** benefit survey/study, might be a vernal pool plant association study which would facilitate and better define mitigation standards for vernal pools. An example of a **moderate to low** ranking might be a resource assessment or population survey that only supplements or reinforces existing data but does not provide significant new information related to the long term sustainability of a population (i.e., use of hair samples to assess distribution and abundance of kit fox).

Partners

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Level of CVP Impacts

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Project Urgency

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Technical Merit and Completeness of Proposal

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion

CP/HRP Cost

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Total Cost

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Total Points

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

(D) OUTREACH/PLANNING/OTHER PROJECTS

Eligibility to Rank

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

CVP Nexus

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Program Priority

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Federally Listed Species Benefits

Proposals are ranked based on the scope and effectiveness of a planning or outreach project. A **major** benefit would be a planning effort that addresses numerous listed species and identifies significant land use changes or restoration efforts that have the potential to significantly improve conditions for species over the long term. An extensive outreach project that addresses numerous species, or focuses effectively on critically endangered species, would also receive a **major** ranking. A **moderate** benefit would be applied to a planning effort in which only modest changes to land uses and/or minimal restoration efforts are outlined. Outreach projects that are limited in scope (# of species and public contact) would receive a **moderate** ranking. A **minimal** ranking would be applied to planning and outreach efforts that address few, if any, listed species and that are so limited in scope no real benefits would be realized over the long term.

State Listed Species

Use guidance for "Federally Listed Species Benefits" in this category to rank this criterion.

Target Species Benefits

Use guidance for "Federally Listed Species Benefits" in this category to rank this criterion.

Habitat/Bio-Diversity

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Cumulative Benefit

This criterion considers a project's impact on species/habitats in relation to the collective influence of other on-going or planned activities related to those species and habitats. An example of a **major** benefit would be a planning/outreach project that is working in conjunction with a larger comprehensive effort (e.g. writing a Conceptual Area Protection Plan as part of a regional conservation strategy, conducting outreach in conjunction with a captive breeding/reintroduction or restoration effort). A **moderate** benefit would be a planning/outreach project that works in conjunction with other more moderate (or fewer) ongoing efforts; and a **minimal** benefit would be a project that is more or less working in isolation and would not be complemented by other on-going efforts.

Long-term Benefit

This criterion is used distinguish between projects that will contribute to a lasting positive effect on species and habitats, as opposed to projects that will result in only a short term gain and that will not "carry over" into future years. A **major** long term benefit would be a plan that outlines permanent, long term strategies (e.g. land acquisition/restoration) applied to an area considered important to species recovery. A **moderate** benefit would be a planning effort that does not include any significant and/or permanent changes affecting species and only slightly changes current practices. A **minor** benefit would be a planning effort that fails to address core issues related to species recovery, and therefore would have little effect on the status of the species over the long term. For outreach projects, a **major**, **moderate** or **minimal** benefit would be determined by assessing to what

extent the outreach effort would continue to affect public awareness over time, or whether the impact of the outreach is relatively short-lived.

Partners

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Level of CVP Impacts

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Project Urgency

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Technical Merit and Completeness of Proposal

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion

CP/HRP Cost

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Total Cost

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

Total Points

Use guidance for Acquisition Projects to rank this criterion.

SECTION VI -- AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

VI.A. AWARD NOTICES

Successful applicants will receive a notice of award of a Grant or Cooperative Agreement document by mail, signed by a Grants Officer, notifying the applicant of project award and project starting date.

VI.B. AWARD DOCUMENT

If your organization is awarded an agreement as a result of this Funding Opportunity Announcement on, the applicable portions of Sections II, III, and VII of this document will be included in the resulting agreement.

VI.C. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS AND DISTRIBUTION

If your organization is awarded an agreement as a result of this Funding Opportunity Announcement, agencies (Reclamation/Service) may require you to submit the following types of reports during the term of the agreement. Detailed information on the type, frequency, and distribution of these reports is available at http://www.usbr.gov/mso/aamd/samples.html#fa, under Financial Assistance, Standard Terms & Conditions – Grants & Cooperative Agreements.

VI.C.1 Financial Reports

- SF-269 or SF-269a, Financial Status Report
- SF-272, Report of Federal Cash Transactions

VI.C.2 Program Performance Reports

- Interim Reports
- Annual Reports
- Final Report

VI.C.3 Geospatial Information System Data Report*

(For all funded projects concerning protection and/or restoration of lands in your project area, we request that you send us information in geospatial/GIS format. We prefer that the data be sent as an ESRI shape file (.shp) projected in Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM), North American Datum (NAD) 83, the Fish and Wildlife Service Standard. Metadata (data documentation) is mandated for all Federal geospatial data. Therefore, for each shape file, please complete and submit the metadata form included in the FOA) (see page 38).

VI.C.4 Significant Developments Reports

SECTION VII -- OTHER INFORMATION

If you are awarded a Grant or Cooperative Agreement as a result of this Funding Opportunity Announcement, General and Special Provisions will be included in the agreement at time of award. The provisions are available at http://www.usbr.gov/mso/aamd/samples.html#fa , under Financial Assistance, Standard Terms & Conditions – Grants & Cooperative Agreements.

VI.C.3 Geospatial Information System Data Report

Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office
Metadata Form

USFWS File (TAILS) Number 81420-

_____

Reference Number from Letter

_____

Project Title:

_____
Descriptive title with project name (Ninth Hole Project boundary).

Information Originator:

_____
Who is creating the data (Contractor's name, company name, address, phone number, email address).

Purpose:

_____
For whom or what project is the data being created (i.e. applicant).

Information Creation Date: _____
Date or dates.

Data Status: _____
Complete/To be updated.

Process Step:

_____
How was the data created or collected? What is the estimated positional accuracy and what is accuracy based on? (GPS, Aerial photo resolution, etc.)

File Format: _____
Shape file, TFW, etc.

Projection and Datum: _____
UTM Zone 10 or 11, NAD83

Attribute Information:

_____
Information (If applicable): Data dictionary for any attribute definitions.

Data Provided In: _____
Email, CD, DVD

Metadata guidelines may be accessed at www.fgdc.gov