RECLAMATION
Managing Water in the West

and
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Pacific Southwest Region

Funding Opportunity Application No. R11AF20001

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

Fiscal Year 2011

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region
http://www.usbr.gov/mp/

U.S. Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
Pacific Southwest Region
http://www.fws.gov/cno/

September 2010

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

Department of the Interior:

U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Mid Pacific Region
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pacific Southwest Region
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

OVERVIEW

Agency Names:	Department of the Interior U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and 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 Application (FOA) No.:	R11AF20001
Application Due Date:	Applications due **November 15, 2010**, 2:00 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; Public Law 102-575, Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Title XXXIV, 3406(b)(1)
Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number	15.512 (Bureau of Reclamation) 15.648 – (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)
Cost Share:	No cost sharing requirement, but level of partnering is considered during proposal evaluation. See Section V.D.11, Program Ranking Criteria, Criterion #11-Partners
Estimated number of agreements to be awarded	10 – 15. Funds may range from $5,000 to $1,000,000 on approved projects.
Total amount of funding available for FY11:	Estimated $3,000,000.00

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section I	General Information: Background and Program Objectives	5-6
Section II	Award Information	6
Section III	Eligibility Information	7-8
Section IV	Application and Proposal Submission Information	9-16
Section V	Application Review Information	17-35
Section VI	Award Administration Information	35-36
Section VII	Other Information	36-37
Attachment A	Example of Species Table	38
Attachment B	Evaluation Form for Technical Review	39-40
Attachment C	Sample Budget Table	41
Attachment D	Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office Metadata Form	42

APPLICATION SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

While it is in the applicant's best interest to read this entire Funding Opportunity Application (FOA), the following table contains a summary of the information that you are required to submit.

Required Content	REQUIRED FORM OR FORMAT	
Cover Page	Sec. IV.C.1.	Name of Requestor, Organization Name, Title of Project and date
First Page	Sec. IV.C.2.	Office of Management and Budget (OMB), Standard Form (SF) 424*, Application for Federal Assistance
Assurances	Sec. IV.C.3.	OMB SF 424B* or SF 424D*, as applicable
Proposal Submission Guidelines	Sec. IV.C.4.	Written proposal in accordance with specified format in this section.
Regulatory Compliance	Sec. IV.D	Applicants are required to comply with all applicable local, state, and Federal environmental, cultural, and paleontological resource protection laws and regulations.
Budget Information	Sec. IV.E.	OMB SF 424A* Budget Information (Non-Construction Programs) or SF 424C* Budget Information (Construction Programs), as applicable
Budget Narrative	Sec. IV.E.2.	Describe in sufficient detail 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 budget narrative information.
Budget Table	Sec. IV.E.2.	Use the table in Attachment C as a budget template. The activity budget should include sufficient **detailed** information to enable Reclamation and the Service to evaluate the reasonableness of the budgeted amount.
*FORMS MAY BE DOWNLOADED FROM WWW.GRANTS.GOV UNDER THE FUNDING OPPORTUNITY, R11AF20001, 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 (ESA) 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) "other" of the CVPIA of the "Fish and Wildlife Restoration Activities" section. The HRP also implements actions to improve conditions for species impacted by the CVP.

1.B PROGRAM AUTHORITY

This FOA 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; and Public Law 102-575, Central Valley Project Improvement Act, Title XXXIV, Section 3406(b)(1).

I.C PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of the CVPCP and HRP for FY 2011 are: (1) protect and restore native habitats impacted by the CVP, and (2) stabilize and improve populations of native species impacted by the CVP. Open solicitation of grant opportunities through the CVPCP and HRP will facilitate meeting these objectives.

I.D OBJECTIVE OF FUNDING OPPORTUNITY APPLICATION

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.E PROJECT ACTIVITIES CATEGORIES

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES CATEGORIES

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. About 50 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds are directed towards this proposed activity.

2) Habitat Restoration: Restoration of CVP-impacted habitats on lands permanently protected for conservation where restoration actions will markedly improve conditions for impacted species.

About 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. About 20 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds are directed towards this proposed activity.

4) Captive Breeding/Management/Outreach: Outreach and education, formulation of land management plans, and captive breeding of listed species that contribute to improving conditions for CVP impacted species and habitats. About 10 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds are directed towards these proposed activities.

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, and the amount of funding available to the programs for fiscal year 2011. Total estimated funding for the program for fiscal year 2011 is $3,000,000. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife (Service) funds may range from $5,000 to $1,000,000 on individually approved projects.

II.B RECLAMATION and SERVICE RESPONSIBILITIES

If substantial involvement between Reclamation/Service and the Recipient is anticipated during the performance of the project, the anticipated award 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

Applicants should be notified by no later than May 2011 on whether or not their proposal(s) was selected for funding. It is anticipated that awards will be made on or before **September 2011**.

SECTION III – ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

III.A ELIGIBLE APPLICANTS

Applicants eligible under this FOA include State or Local government agencies, private non-profit or profit organizations, individuals, and educational institutions.

Federal agencies may apply to the CVPCP and HRP 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 partnering is highly encouraged and the level of partnering (i.e., cost sharing) is considered during proposal evaluation. Refer to the ranking guidelines in Section V.D.11 Evaluation and Ranking - Criterion #11.

III.C EVALUATION CRITERIA AND WEIGHTING: Refer to Sections V.B. and V.D.

III.D METHODS FOR EVALUATING AND RANKING APPLICATIONS:

All proposal applications are reviewed and ranked by the CVPCP & HRP Technical Team, comprised of State and Federal agency biologists and Program Managers. The Technical Team consists of technical experts whose expertise spans the range of topics covered by the submitted proposals. The Technical Team evaluates and provides qualitative and unambiguous ratings of each proposal by utilizing ranking criteria described in Section V to evaluate proposals, and makes recommendations on which proposals should be selected for funding.

The ranking criteria presented in this FOA are implemented in the context of general considerations of the CVPCP/HRP Technical Team and Program Managers, who can influence final decisions regarding funding. These considerations include, but are not limited to:

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

2) The past performance of an applicant is considered during project selection. Poor performance during implementation of past grant, cooperative or interagency agreements might weigh against further funding. The CVPCP and HRP Program Managers and/or the CVPCP/HRP grants Technical Team can choose to disqualify an applicant based on poor past performance.

3) 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. The cost effectiveness of the project is considered in the selection process.

III.E SUBMISSION DEADLINE and LOCATION for SUBMISSION:

Submission deadline is November 15, 2010 at 2:00 p.m. PST. The proposal application should be mailed to Maria E. Castaneda, MP-3813, Bureau of Reclamation, 2800 Cottage Way, Room E-1815, Sacramento, CA 95825-1898. See Section IV for instructions on proposal submission.

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.C of this FOA.

III.F.2. Project and Budget Proposals

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

III.F.3. Project Location

The CVPCP and HRP have established a priority project area map that delineates the specific area of California within which projects will be funded through this application. Proposals for projects will not be considered for funding that fall outside the boundaries of the program project area unless a clear CVP nexus can be demonstrated (see Section V.D.2 Criterion #2 – CVP Nexus, for additional information). The Priority Project Area map can be viewed by visiting *http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/map/index.html*

III.F.4. Other Regulations

Applicants shall adhere to Federal, State, 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.D for additional information regarding environmental and regulatory compliance and approvals.

III.F.5. Species Reporting

Recipients are required to submit sightings of Federal or State-listed endangered or threatened species or other sensitive species to the State of California's Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB) that they encounter in the process of fulfilling their grant agreement. The documentation of occurrences of species in the CNDDB is important for the conservation and recovery of the species.

III.F.6. Post funding site access.

For all funded projects, there is an expectation that a representative of the CVPCP and/or HRP be provided access to the project site, either directly or through the grant recipient, in order to monitor compliance with the terms of the grant agreement, the presence of species of interest, ecological responses to the project action, etc.

III.G. Department of Interior Landscape Conservation Cooperative

All applicants are requested to address how their proposed project will contribute to the goals and objectives of the Department of Interior's (DOI) California Landscape Conservation Cooperative (LCC), the centerpiece of DOI's climate change strategy. The LCC informs resource management decisions to address landscape-scale stressors effecting wildlife populations including habitat fragmentation, genetic isolation, the spread of invasive species, and water scarcity – all of which are accelerated by climate change. Information on the LCC can be found at the following website: *http://www.fws.gov/cno*

SECTION IV – APPLICATION 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:

E-mail: mcastaneda@usbr.gov

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

IV.A.2 The contact information for the CVPCP and HRP is:

RECLAMATION:

Mr. Dan Strait/MP-152
CVPCP and HRP Manager
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento CA 95825-1898
(916) 978-5052
Email: dstrait@usbr.gov

SERVICE:

Ms. Caroline Prose
HRP Manager
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Pacific Southwest Region
2800 Cottage Way
Sacramento CA 95825
(916) 414-6575
Email: caroline_prose@fws.gov

I.V.A.3. Interested organizations or individuals having difficulties accessing forms/electronic addresses, or questions pertaining to the Standard Form 424, Application for Federal Assistance, may contact Maria E. Castaneda at (916) 978-5148 or via email at mcastaneda@usbr.gov.

IV.B INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS

IV.B.1. Submit one original and three paper copies of the proposal, and an electronic copy on a CD. Colored maps, photos, figures, etc. should be submitted in color with the original and the copies. Each applicant shall submit proposals in accordance with the instructions contained in this section. Detailed instructions for each element 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 may result in the application being rejected or not funded. Mailing materials, package, or packing envelopes of the proposal must reference the **FOA number** R11AF20001. **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 Budget Proposals in accordance with the formats described below.

Proposals shall be submitted to the following person and address:

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. Deadline for Receipt of Proposals

Proposals will be accepted until 2:00 p.m., Pacific Standard Time, on November 15, 2010. Proposals received after this date and time will not be considered for award.

IV.C PROPOSAL SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS

IV.C.1. Cover Page. Include the name of the requestor, organization name, title of project and date

IV.C.2. First Page – The first 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 and who will be the official point of contact during the application process. **Inclusion of a properly signed and dated 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 R11AF20001, Full Announcement or Application.**

IV.C.3. 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 and dated 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, R11AF20001, Full Announcement or Application.**

IV.C.4. Proposal Submission Guidelines and Format

Applicants should adhere to the following guidelines when submitting proposals:

Proposals must have a page number on every page.

The proposal text should be no longer than 20 pages, excluding SF424s, cover page, literature cited, maps, photographs, figures, tables, and other attachments. It is essential that all information critical to the evaluation be contained in the text of the proposal. All maps, photographs, figures, or tables must follow the text, be individually numbered, and clearly titled.

Applicants should submit well described and technically accurate proposal packages organized in the following required format:

IV.C.4.1 Title of Project: State the title of the project.

IV.C.4.2. Abstract: Submit a brief abstract in standard abstract format.

IV.C.4.3. Proposal Category: List the category of the project activity, e.g., Acquisition, Restoration, Research, or Captive Breeding/Management/Outreach.

IV.C.4.4. Project Objective(s): Clearly state the objective(s) that the project will achieve when fully implemented.

IV.C.4.5. Proposal Proponent: Provide the name, address, phone number, fax number, and email address of the main/primary technical point of contact.

IV.C.4.6. Location of Project: All project proposals must include a clear and detailed color map indicating local reference points and the location of the project within the CVPCP and HRP project area boundary (see website for CVPCP and HRP Project Area Map at www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/program_cvp/index.html). Include photographs of the project site, if applicable. For acquisition and restoration projects, include a detailed legal description – Meridian, Township, Range, Section - of the project location, including size in acre(s) of the project area.

IV.C.4.7. Amount of Funding Request: Specify the amount of funds requested from the CVPCP/HRP.

IV.C.4.8. Total Project Cost: Specify the total estimated cost of the project including in-kind and cost-share contributions.

IV.C.4.9. Proposed Activities: For the action being proposed for funding, provide a detailed description and clear tasks to be accomplished including, but not limited to, the following:

- Provide any relevant background information, such as species biology, surrounding land-uses, etc.
- State the type(s) of habitat and the number of acres of each habitat type that would be acquired or restored if funded (**for acquisition or restoration proposals**).
- Provide enough information about potential effects from the project, so that the environmental impact analysis can be facilitated and the compliance requirements can be satisfied; the proposal should have enough detail to assess whether proposed goals can be achieved. (Examples of questions for restoration 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, maps and figures as necessary).
- Discuss and provide citations for any previous efforts and pre-existing data related to the project.
- Discuss and clearly describe field techniques, study design, type of data collection, survey methodology and statistical methods, type of analysis being conducted, etc. **(for research proposals)**.
- Answer the question: Why is this project needed?

IV.C.4.10. Project Timeline: Include milestones and the final completion date for each task.

IV.C.4.11. Existing Habitat and Species Baseline Conditions: Describe the habitat conditions and species occurrences at the project site. Include references to biological surveys that can verify these conditions and occurrences. Conditions should be described for Federal and State listed species as well as other Federal and State designated species.

IV.C.4.12. Measuring Results: Describe how the results of the project would be measured when implemented. Examples of project results that could be measured are species survival, numbers of individuals detected during surveys, increases in baseline conditions, acres of each habitat type that would be acquired or restored, etc. If applicable, describe circumstances of known land access vs. unknown land access. For example, describe which lands have access granted and which lands do not. Address how potentially not obtaining access to lands will affect the results of the research. Specify how much (percentage) of the surveys, etc. needs to be conducted on private lands vs.

public lands.

IV.C.4.13. Monitoring and Management: This criterion applies to acquisition and restoration projects only. Long-term management and maintenance of protected and restored lands are critical for achieving the full benefits to CVP impacted species which the CVP/HRP are intended to achieve. That can only be achieved by developing and implementing a long term monitoring and management plan for the site. Describe any existing land management plans for which the program goals will be accomplished and carried forward in the future, or how and when such plans will be written if planned. Examples of land management activities that should be addressed in the plans include grazing management, management of recreation and other human uses, invasive species and other potential pests, and development and management of water. Monitoring and management plans must be submitted for all land acquisitions prior to close of title. Recipients must submit a plan for monitoring and managing the project area prior to receiving CVPCP/HRP funding. **Proposals submitted without reference to, or a description of, a monitoring and management plan will not be considered for funding.**

IV.C.4.14. Resume: Provide a one-page résumé or curriculum vitae for each person who would be significantly involved in the project.

IV.C.4.15. Relationship of Proposal to Program Ranking Criteria:
Each proposal will be ranked by the CVPCP/HRP technical team using a total of up to 19 Program Ranking Criteria. Section V.D lists these criteria and shows the range of points that are given for each criterion. Of the 19 criteria, below are those which the applicant must address according to the category of proposal being submitted (Acquisition, Restoration, Research, or Captive Breeding/ Management/Outreach). **Each applicant is strongly encouraged to provide as much information as possible for each applicable criterion for each proposal, since awarding of grant funding is strongly tied to ranking scores.**

- CVP Nexus: Indicate the proposal's relationship to the CVP. Proposals must adequately define this relationship to be considered for evaluation. Priority will be given to proposals that are located within a CVP service area, consolidated place of use and/or area receiving CVP water. See the CVPCP and HRP website for the Project Area Map.

- Program Priority Action(s): Per the current fiscal year Program Priority Actions specified in the FOA on www.grants.gov, proposals must state which Priority Action the proposal addresses, and describe how the project relates to the Priority Action. The Program Priority Actions are fully described in Section V.C of this FOA.

- Federally Listed Species (includes species proposed for listing): The proposal must indicate in as much detail as possible how the project will benefit federally Endangered or Threatened species, including species Proposed for listing, and how many and which 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 agency biologists having personal knowledge that a species is present at the proposed site). Provide a table listing these species and their status**. Applicants should use the species table example in Attachment A as a template**. Also describe whether the proposed action will address species' recovery plan tasks, which tasks are addressed, and state whether designated "critical habitat" is part of the project. It is highly encouraged that status surveys be conducted prior to submitting a proposal. If the project includes a private land access component, an access agreement should already be obtained, or a convincing description of successful access should be included, in order to accurately describe species benefits.

- State Listed Species: The proposal must indicate how State Endangered, Threatened, Rare (plants), Candidate, and Fully Protected species may benefit from the project. Apply the same provisions as indicated for Federal species and include in a species table. **Applicants should use the species table example in Attachment A as a template**.

- Other Designated Species: The proposal must describe how other Federal and State designated species may benefit from the project. These species must be different than those listed under the Federal and State Endangered or Threatened species categories. Apply the same provisions as indicated for Federal and State species and include in a species table. **Applicants should use the species table example in Attachment A as a template.** Other designated species include Federal Candidate Species and State Species of Special Concern.

- Habitat/Biodiversity: The proposal must describe vegetation types and species diversity within the project area, how the project will help maintain or benefit these components, and the importance of the habitat. **For Acquisition, Restoration, and Captive Breeding/ Management/Outreach projects only.**

- Cumulative Benefit: The proposal must indicate how the project relates to the collective influence of other on-going or planned activities related to the same species or habitats. For example, identify related CVPCP/HRP-funded projects by searching the project database on the CVPCP and HRP website in addition to listing other funded, related, on-going, or planned activities.

- Long-term Benefit: The proposal must address how the project benefits might persist or increase over time.

- Project Site Connectivity: The proposal must describe how the project is physically connected to another protected or restored parcel. **For Acquisition and Restoration projects only.**

- Partners: The proposal must indicate the amount of contributions or in-kind services (expressed as dollar amounts) from identified project monetary partners. Specify/distinguish amount of partnering from amount of funding requested from CVPCP and HRP in relation to the total cost of the project. Also specify if funding requested from CVPCP/HRP is being requested concurrently from other sources. The Budget Proposal Instructions are found in section IV.E.

- Level of CVP Impacts: The proposal must address to what extent a species or habitat was impacted by the CVP.

- Project Urgency: The proposal must assign a scale of urgency to the action based on the endangerment of a species, the level of threat to a habitat area, and/or the consequence to the species should the project not be carried out. Additionally, a complete explanation on the rationale for this scale should be provided. See the CVPCP and HRP website for priority habitat types and species: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/species/index.html)

IV.D. ENVIRONMENTAL AND REGULATORY COMPLIANCE, APPROVALS

Applicants are required to comply with all applicable local, State, and Federal 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 Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, and the National Historic Preservation Act,

which requires consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office, 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, i.e. categorical exclusion, 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 (e.g., land access) are required, and explain the applicant's plan for obtaining such permits or approvals.

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

IV.E BUDGET PROPOSAL INSTRUCTIONS

IV.E.1 General Requirements

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, **R11AF20001**, Full Announcement or Application.

The applicant must also include a budget table and narrative with the estimated costs to conduct the proposed activity. The budget table 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 only the CVPCP/HRP requested funds).

IV.E.2 Budget Narrative and Table Formats

Provide a detailed budget summary that indicates annual costs by tasks and funding category, and include cost share partners. **Applicants should provide a budget table, using the Budget Table Template shown in Attachment C.**

The project budget must be summarized in a table format followed by a complete description of each item. The activity budget should include sufficient **detailed** information to enable the Technical Team to evaluate the reasonableness of the budgeted amount. Listed below are additional instructions for some common budget categories. Not all proposals will have costs in each category. The 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 the "Other" category, provide information that describes how the budget amount was estimated, the assumptions it is based upon, etc. **Additionally, for multi-year projects, identify separate costs and tasks for each year.**

In all cases, sufficient information must be provided to allow a determination that the budget is fair and reasonable for the proposed activity. An award will not be made to any applicant who fails to fully disclose and specify all project costs. **See Attachment C, Budget Table Template on Page 41.**

The basis of all costs in the SF-424 and proposed budget must be documented and defensible in

order for the CVPCP/HRP to determine fair and reasonable costs, regardless of whether the cost is funded by the CVPCP/HRP or another funding entity. This includes matching or in-kind costs.

If your proposal is selected for funding, a cost analysis may be conducted on the proposed budget prior to obligation of the award. Budgeted labor costs (labor categories, direct labor rates, hours per labor category) and fringe benefits, material costs by type, sub-recipient costs, travel, and any other direct and indirect costs are subject to evaluation. Recipients may be contacted by a cost analyst for additional supporting documentation for the estimated costs in the SF-424 and budget. In preparation for the cost analysis, proposal proponents should be prepared to provide additional documentation for ANY costs displayed in the SF-424 of the proposal, including for funds offered as cost-share by the proposal proponent or other partner. For example, any amount included as a cost share contribution on the SF-424 is subject to review by a government cost analyst, if the proposal is selected for funding.

Fringe benefits and overhead costs should be supported by recommended rates for Federal, State, or other appropriate source which identifies the rates as having been audited and recommended.

It is strongly recommended that project proponents use the Government Services Administration (GSA)-approved mileage, lodging, and per diem rates, if applicable, at the time of the grant application.

For additional information, please see all applicable Office of Management and Budget (OMB) circulars related to federal financial assistance budget and audit requirements, including but not limited to:

OMB Circular A-110 (Uniform administrative requirements for Grants and Other Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals and Other Non-Profit Organizations);
OMB Circular A-102 (Grants and Cooperative Agreements with State and Local Governments);
OMB Circular A-21 (Cost Principles for Educational Institutions);
OMB Circular A-87 (Cost Principles for State, Local and Indian Tribal Governments);
OMB Circular A-122 (Cost Principles for Nonprofit Organizations);
OMB Circular A-133 (Audits of States, Local Governments and Non-Profit Organizations)

IV.E.2.1. Salaries and Wages – Identify the personnel, by title, who will conduct the proposed activity. For all identified positions, indicate the 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.E.2.2. Fringe Benefits – Indicate the rate or amount estimated for fringe benefits, 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.E.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. Indicate whether these rates are used for proposal purposes only or whether they are fixed or provisional rates

for billing purposes. Federally-approved lodging, miscellaneous and incidental expenses, and mileage rate agreements are acceptable for compliance with this item.

IV.E.2.4. Equipment – Identify the type of equipment to be used (or purchased), hourly rate of use (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.E.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.E.2.6. Contractual – Identify all work that will be accomplished by sub-recipients or consultants, including detailed budget estimate of time, rates, supplies, and materials that will be required for the task. If a sub-recipient 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.E.2.7. Environmental and Regulatory Compliance Costs, Approvals – Reference all environmental and regulatory costs that are not incurred by Reclamation/Service (i.e., State and local).

IV.E.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. If tasks involve access to private lands, then land access and project activities on private lands where access has not yet been obtained should be shown as separate tasks with separate budget amounts in the budget table, and explained in the budget narrative. Describe how the budget would be affected if access to lands is not granted as anticipated.

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

IV.E.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 (see Section IV.E.2.) for the recipient's organization. It is not acceptable to simply incorporate indirect rates within other direct cost line items.

If the recipient has separate rates for recovery of labor overhead and general and administrative costs, each rate shall be shown. The applicant should propose rates for evaluation purposes which will be used as fixed or ceiling rates in any resulting award. Include a copy of any federally-approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement.

If you do not have a Federally-approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement or if unapproved rates are used, explain why, and include the computational basis for the indirect expense pool and corresponding allocation base for each rate. Information on “Preparing and Submitting Indirect Cost Proposals” is available from the Department of the Interior, National Business Center, Indirect Cost Section, at http://www.aqd.nbc.gov/Services/ICS.aspx

IV.E.2.11. Total Cost – Indicate the total cost of the project, including requested amount from CVPCP/HRP and Federal and non-Federal (partner cost-share and in-kind) amounts.

IV.F APPLICATION SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

An Application Submission Checklist is included on **page 4** of this FOA. The Checklist contains a summary of the information you are **required** to submit with your application.

SECTION V – APPLICATION REVIEW INFORMATION

V.A. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Applications will be evaluated by a technical panel in accordance with these criteria and the corresponding weight assigned to each criterion.

The following criteria and points will be used to score the applications received. This information is provided to assist the applicant in preparing a detailed project description. Your application should thoroughly address each of the criteria and sub-criteria in the order presented to assist in the complete and accurate evaluation of your application.

V.B. PROGRAM RANKING CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated by the CVPCP & HRP Technical Team in accordance with the 19 Program Ranking Criteria listed below. These ranking criteria are fully described in section V.D.

(1) Eligibility to Rank: Y = yes
N = no

(2) CVP Nexus: Y = yes
N = no

(3) Program Priority Action: Point numbers are in accordance with Priority Actions within each activity category. The FY 2011 Priority Actions are fully described in section V.C

(4) Federally Listed Species (includes species Proposed for Listing) Benefits:

0 = No benefits to federally listed/proposed species
1-2 = **Minimal** benefits to federally listed/proposed species
3-4 = **Moderate** benefits to federally listed/proposed species
5-6 = **Major** benefits to federally listed/proposed species

(5) State Listed Species Benefits:

0 = No benefits to State listed species
1 = **Minimal** benefits to State listed species
2 = **Moderate** benefits to State listed species
3 = **Major** benefits to State listed species

(6) Other Designated Species Benefits:

0 = No benefits to other designated species
1 = **Minimal** benefits to other designated species
2 = **Moderate** benefits to other designated species
3 = **Major** benefits to other designated species

(7) Habitats/Biodiversity:
(for Acq/Rest proposals)
0 = none
1-2 = low
3-4 = medium

5-6 = high

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

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

(10) Project Site Connectivity:
(for Acq/Rest proposals)
0 = none
1 = low
2 = medium
3 = high

(11) 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

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

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

(14) Technical Merit and Completeness of Proposal:

0 = none
2 = low
4 = medium
6 = high

(15) Scientific Merit:
(for Research proposals)
0 = none
3 = low
6 = medium
9 = high

(16) Acres: For informational purposes only

(17) Program Cost: For informational purposes only

(18) Total Cost: For informational purposes only

(19) Total Points Sum of all applicable criteria for the proposal

V.C FISCAL YEAR 2011 PRIORITY ACTIONS

The CVPCP and HRP have established Priority Actions related to CVP impacted federally listed species, their habitats, and corresponding geographic areas. They reflect the most current evaluation of species needs and habitat trends, and are complementary to other on-going conservation actions within the Central Valley. They also take into account historical levels of investment by the Programs, as well as future threats to specific ecosystems. Priority Actions have been developed specifically for fiscal year 2011 and are listed in four categories below: Acquisition, Habitat Restoration, Research, and Captive Breeding/Management/Outreach. Well-conceived and clearly written proposals must address the Priority Actions listed below. The Priority Actions are listed in order of preference within each activity category. The number of points assigned to each Priority Action within each category is indicated in parentheses below (see Section V.D.3 Criterion #3, for more information). Please note that the geographic area of all submitted proposals must be within the Priority Project Area boundary unless a CVP nexus can otherwise be demonstrated. Additionally, all proposals must be separate and independent of future funding. Successful completion of the project, and all deliverables resulting from the grant, should not be dependent upon future funding.

V.C.1. Acquisition Priority Actions

Parcels proposed for fee title or conservation easement acquisition that have documented occurrences of CVP impacted federally listed species will likely rank higher than those that do not. ***NOTE: If an acquisition proposal is selected for funding, appraisals of parcels for fee title or conservation easement acquisition must be completed under the supervision of the Department of Interior's (DOI) Appraisal Services Directorate (ASD) to ensure appraisals meet DOI standards. Appraisals submitted without DOI/ASD guidance will most likely not be approved**. Additionally, the parcel(s) to be acquired must be identified in the proposal, and the willing seller(s) of the parcel(s) identified.

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 protect and preserve, through fee title or conservation easement acquisition, existing habitat and provide for the protection and management of occupied habitat, as well as unoccupied serpentine grasslands that act as corridors or stepping stones between known populations of bay checkerspot butterfly and other listed serpentine species. Proposals must emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks for serpentine species found in the Implementation Schedule in the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a). (6 points)

2*. Additional land to contribute to Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge in Contra Costa County.* The Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge is occupied by three federally listed species: the Contra Costa wallflower, the Antioch Dunes evening primrose, and the Lange's metalmark butterfly. The CVPCP and HRP will consider proposals that acquire and preserve existing habitat for these species. Proposals must provide assurances that, subsequent to acquisition, the acquired land would be restored and managed for the benefit of the species. Proposals must emphasize implementation of the *Revised Recovery Plan for Three Endangered Species Endemic to Antioch Dunes, California* (USFWS 1984). (5 points)

3. *Habitat protection activities in eastern Alameda County that will help conserve CVP impacted listed species located there.* Priority will be given to conservation actions that protect, through fee title or conservation easement acquisition (a) chaparral/grassland/oak savannah matrix important for Alameda whipsnake feeding, breeding, dispersal, and movement; (b) 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 must emphasize implementation of appropriate recovery 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). (4 points)

4. *San Joaquin Valley floor habitat and rangeland protection.* Acquire through fee title or conservation easement, alkali sink, alkali scrub, and valley grassland habitat located on the 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, and federally listed plant species particularly Bakersfield cactus, Hartweg's golden sunburst, palmate-bracted bird's-beak and other species dependent upon this habitat complex. For the San Joaquin kit fox, the only areas that will be considered for land acquisition are the following: Ciervo- Panoche and Pleasant Valley areas, lands north of the Carrizo Plain National Monument, western Fresno County, Madera County, and areas around Santa Nella, Los Banos and Tracy where linkages between occupied habitats are in danger of being lost. Proposals must emphasize implementation of priority one and two tasks as described in Tables 5 and 7 for the species found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b). (3 points)

5. *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 conservation easement acquisition, existing natural 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). Where possible, proposals should consider protecting lands that will compliment existing protected lands and contribute to protection of contiguous blocks of habitat. Proposals must emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks found in the Implementation Schedule of the *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005) for the following Zone 1 and 2 Core Areas: Chico, Doe Mill, Red Bluff, Black Butte, Orland, Cosumnes/Rancho Seco, Mather, Merced, Madera, San Joaquin, Farmington, Waterford, Turlock, Western Placer County, and Grasslands Ecological Area. (2 points)

6. *Wetland, riparian, and other aquatic habitats and associated uplands supporting species such as giant garter snake, riparian brush rabbit, riparian woodrat, California red-legged frog, valley elderberry longhorn beetle, southwestern willow flycatcher, and least Bell's vireo, with a special emphasis on the San Joaquin Valley.* Actions will be considered that protect habitat through fee title acquisition or conservation easement. Proposals must emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for species found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b), *Recovery Plan for the California Red-legged Frog* (USFWS 2002b), *Valley Elderberry Longhorn Beetle Recovery Plan* (USFWS 1984), *Draft Recovery Plan for Least Bell's Vireo* (USFWS 1998c), and *Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Recovery Plan (USFWS 2002c)*. (1 point)

7. Other fee title or conservation easement acquisitions that address CVPCP/HRP goals of protecting, enhancing, and restoring CVP impacted federally listed species populations and their habitats within the CVPCP/HRP project area map boundary. See the CVPCP and HRP website for priority habitat types and species included in these programs: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/species/index.html. As applicable, proposals must emphasize priority one and two tasks found in the USFWS Recovery Plans associated with the species and habitats to be benefitted by the proposed action. (0 points)

V.C.2. Habitat Restoration Priority Actions

In order to qualify as a restoration Priority Action, habitat restoration projects proposed for funding must: pertain to the restoration or enhancement of native plant communities; pertain to the ecosystem functions and values to which the species targeted in the Priority Actions are adapted; benefit the full suite of species in an ecosystem; and address only CVP impacted species. Proposals that focus on restoration of individual species of plants or animals (i.e., only 1 – 3 species) will not be considered under a restoration Priority Action unless specifically indicated below. Additionally, restoration proposals may be subjected to additional evaluation by experts in the scientific community, as warranted. Also, to be eligible for funding, the restoration action must occur on lands permanently protected by fee title, conservation easement, or other formal status where the habitat(s) restored are specifically managed.

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, control of invasive nonnative plants, etc. Proposals must emphasize priority one and two tasks for serpentine species found in the Implementation Schedule of the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a). (4 points)

2. *San Joaquin Valley ecosystem restoration that results in the following vegetation types: alkali sink, alkali scrub, and valley grassland habitats.* Restoration located in the San Joaquin Valley that contributes to species recovery will be prioritized. Projects receiving priority consideration will be those that benefit core and satellite population areas and emphasize habitat connectivity for the following federally listed animal and plant species: San Joaquin kit fox, blunt-nosed leopard lizard, Tipton kangaroo rat, giant kangaroo rat, Fresno kangaroo rat, Buena Vista Lake shrew, California jewelflower, palmate-bracted bird's beak, Kern mallow, San Joaquin woolly-threads, and Bakersfield cactus. Areas selected for restoration should demonstrate presence of one or more of the species noted above. Restoration efforts should also benefit habitat linkages and corridors of the listed animal species. Proposals must 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). (3 points)

3. *Habitat restoration activities in eastern Alameda County and eastern Contra Costa County that will help conserve CVP impacted federally listed species located there.* Projects receiving priority consideration will be those that protect (a) pallid manzanita/chaparral/grassland/oak savannah matrix important for Alameda whipsnake feeding, breeding, dispersal, and movement; (b) 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 federally 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, and Alameda County and areas outside the County. Proposals must emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for Alameda County and Contra Costa 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). (2 points)

4. *Restoration of non-vernal pool wetlands, riparian habitats, and associated uplands supporting the giant garter snake, riparian brush rabbit, or riparian woodrat within the historic range of these species in the Central Valley.* Actions should emphasize large-scale habitat connectivity. Additionally, actions will be considered that restore habitat, improve water quality, and establish refugia for species in

flood zones. Proposals must emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for species found in the following recovery plans: *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley*, *California* (USFWS 1998b) and *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake* (USFWS 1999). (1 point)

5. Other habitat restoration or enhancement that address CVPCP/HRP goals of protecting, enhancing, and restoring CVP impacted federally listed species populations and their habitats within the CVPCP/HRP project area map boundary. See the CVPCP and HRP website for priority habitat types and species included in these programs: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/species/index.html. As applicable, proposals must emphasize priority one and two tasks found in the USFWS Recovery Plans associated with the species and habitats to be benefitted by the proposed action. (0 points)

V.C.3. Research Priority Actions

Research Priority Actions are action-specific, therefore, only proposals that address the actions specified below in the Research category will be considered for ranking. At a minimum, research proposals must: include a clear and detailed study methodology; describe how deliverables would increase current and future conservation and/or restoration of species impacted by the CVP; and describe how the research findings would benefit federally listed species. Multi-year projects must detail how adequate data collection would be achieved if successive years are unfunded. If projects are multi-year, the budget should be itemized for each year of research. Multi-year projects will be considered based on prior performance and funding availability. If permits will be required to undertake the research, proposals must address how those permits are to be obtained. For all work that includes a GIS component, the USFWS' Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office GIS branch must be consulted during project design, in order to ensure that all work products and deliverables are consistent with USFWS GIS needs. All GIS work must conform to USFWS standards (please see section VII.C.4. of this FOA for more information). All research proposals will be subjected to additional evaluation by experts in the scientific community on the various research topics proposed (please see Attachment B, which shows the evaluation form that will be used by the reviewers for each Research proposal).

If any animals are held live in captivity during the course of the research/study, the applicant must describe in the proposal what will happen to the animals after the study is completed, i.e., be returned to the wild, be kept in captivity, etc.

1. *Conduct research into the development of captive propagation techniques for listed species endemic to serpentine soil, and associated habitats supporting endemic species, in Santa Clara County.* Proposals will be considered that develop captive propagation techniques for the bay checkerspot butterfly, nectar plants of the bay checkerspot butterfly, and propagation techniques for federally listed plants in Santa Clara County. Proposals must emphasize appropriate priority one and two tasks in the Implementation Schedule for serpentine species found in the *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a). (6 points)

2. *Modeling the effects of climate change on vernal pool species and habitat*. Proposals will be considered that model how climate change throughout the Central Valley will impact the hydrology, persistence, and species composition of vernal pools to help ecologists and land managers identify vernal pool complexes that are potentially the most resilient or vulnerable to climate change. Models must include a range of climate change scenarios based upon the most recent data from the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). In order to maximize the application of models to conservation, the vernal pool characteristics examined (e.g., pool size, shape, volume, slope, depth of hard pan, etc.), must be derived from field data of existing vernal pool complexes throughout the Central Valley. Proposals must address the impact on different vernal pool regions, the geophysical characteristics that promote vernal pool persistence in the face of climate change, and other stressors. Proposed research will result in a detailed report that describes 1) vernal pool core areas

(see *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon*) most likely to be lost, 2) vernal pool core areas most likely to persist, 3) vernal pool characteristics associated with loss/persistence, and 4) strategies/management practices that will promote vernal pool persistence. (5 points)

3. *San Joaquin kit fox population detection and modeling.* The San Joaquin kit fox is a native endemic fox of California's San Joaquin Valley which is threatened by low population numbers and continued development in the Central Valley. Proposed population detection and modeling projects should be collaborative, multi-partner efforts to develop detection methodologies that allow for range-wide development of 1) estimates of population presence and census size, 2) probability of detection based upon standardized survey protocols, and 3) habitat suitability models. These research products should directly lead to development of a comprehensive conservation strategy for San Joaquin kit fox. Proposals whose products are applicable to other species of conservation concern will receive greater consideration during ranking. Proposals must address priority one tasks for the San Joaquin kit fox identified in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b). (4 points)

4. *Continuation of activities to map and quantify the acreage of currently occupied and suitable vernal pool habitats, and occupied and suitable habitats, present in 2005 (the year that the USFWS vernal pool recovery plan was published), 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 within the CVPCP and HRP Project Area boundaries for Tehama, Glenn, and/or San Joaquin Counties have the highest priority. Successful proposals will integrate previous mapping efforts, particularly those funded by CVPCP/HRP, and must include a ground-truthing component. Analysis methods must be applicable to all species and core areas. (3 points)

5. *Provide information on riparian woodrat distribution, demography, and habitat requirements to further the recovery of the species at the 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. Basic information on distribution, abundance and habitat associations is needed to guide management of the riparian woodrat at the Refuge. Products include surveying and mapping of historic range/occurrences and current areas surveyed for existing populations (on- and off-Refuge), population estimates, habitat definitions, development of GIS layers of vegetation types, existing habitat connectivity, and a predictive habitat model (of habitat and habitat connectivity). Fully describe and justify all data collection methods. Applicants must fully describe and justify all surveying and trapping methods. No disturbance of nests or collection of nest material will be authorized. Proposals must emphasize recommended conservation actions and Priority 1 and 2 tasks found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b). (2 points)

6. *Development of habitat restoration methods for giant garter snakes in the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys.* One of the primary limiting factors in the current distribution of the giant garter snake is available habitat. This is particularly true in the San Joaquin Valley where giant garter snake habitat has been drastically reduced from historic levels. Consequently, habitat restoration is a critical recovery need (see recovery objectives 1.2, 1.3, and 4.10 of the *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake*). For successful habitat restoration to occur, methods must be rigorously statistically tested within an adaptive management framework. Proposals will be considered that: 1) examine the use of particular restoration features (e.g., debris piles, water depth profiles, etc.), 2) examine differing restoration needs in the San Joaquin and Sacramento Valleys, and 3) provide a statistical comparison between methodologies. The research should result in detailed adaptive management recommendations for habitat restoration of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valley populations of giant garter snakes, provide guidance for future habitat restoration, and lay the ground work for future reintroductions of giant garter snakes into restored habitat. (1 point)

V.C.4. <u>Captive Breeding/Management/Outreach</u>

This category focuses on three main types of projects: (1) capture, propagation, release, and subsequent monitoring of a species; (2) development of land and/or species population management plans; and (3) development of Central Valley habitats and/or species outreach plans. The goal for each of these types of projects is the recovery of federally listed species impacted by the CVP. Concerning projects that entail captive breeding, if any animals are held live in captivity during the course of the research/study, the applicant must describe in the proposal what will happen to the animals after the study is completed, i.e., be returned to the wild, be kept in captivity, etc.

1. *Lange's metalmark butterfly captive breeding program at the Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge in Contra Costa County.* Actions will be considered that continue the current captive breeding program to raise Lange's metalmark butterflies and release them at the Refuge. Proposals must clearly define and establish criteria for completion of captive propagation activities. Proposals must emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for species found in the *Revised Recovery Plan for Three Endangered Species Endemic to Antioch Dunes, California* (USFWS 1980). (5 points)

2. *Development of a long-term management plan for restoration of riverine dune habitat for the Lange's metalmark butterfly and two listed plant species at the Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge in Contra Costa County.* Proposals should include development of a long-term management plan for restoration of the native plant community at the Refuge to facilitate recovery of the Lange's metalmark butterfly; the auriculate naked-stemmed buckwheat (host plant for the Lange's metalmark butterfly); and the listed Antioch Dunes evening primrose and Contra Costa wallflower. The management plan should include a key factor analysis to determine critical paths for the recovery of the Lange's metalmark butterfly. Additionally, at a minimum, the following actions should be addressed: restoration actions at the Refuge and adjacent lands, such as dune creation, herbicide use, grazing, fire management, invasive species removal, etc; landowner incentives such as the existing Safe Harbor Agreement; conservation easement/fee title acquisitions; and any other actions that could contribute to the recovery of the Lange's metalmark butterfly and the listed plant species. Management plans must also include a summary of past restoration work including descriptions and maps of areas planted to Antioch Dunes evening primrose, Contra Costa wallflower, and auriculate naked-stemmed buckwheat, invasive plant removal, riverine dune restoration, etc., as well as a plan and maps for future activities. Proposals should clearly define and establish criteria for the completion of the restoration of the native plant community, and an estimated schedule of when these completion criteria are expected to be met. As appropriate, management plans must emphasize priority one and two tasks for species identified in the *Revised Recovery Plan for Three Endangered Species Endemic to Antioch Dunes, California* (USFWS 1980). (4 points)

3. *Captive propagation and reintroduction of riparian brush rabbit.* The ongoing riparian brush rabbit recovery project at the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge and other lands is the primary recovery effort for this species, one of the most endangered mammals in California. Extensive land acquisition, riparian restoration, flood refugia construction, and endangered species recovery work has been completed over the past decade. However, additional funding is needed for the continuation of successful efforts to date in which riparian brush rabbits have been captively propagated and reintroduced to their native habitat. Proposed activities should include captive propagation, health screening, reintroduction, monitoring of collared and tagged rabbits, habitat assessments, and reporting. Proposals should clearly define and establish criteria for completion of captive propagation activities, and an estimate of when these completion criteria are expected to be met. Proposals must emphasize priority 1 and 2 tasks in the Implementation Schedule found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b). (3 points)

4. *Develop plans for species introductions or reintroductions to re-establish extirpated populations of*

federally listed plants as described in USFWS recovery plan step-down narratives. Proposals must emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for species found in the following recovery plans: *Recovery Plan for Serpentine Soil Species of the San Francisco Bay Area* (USFWS 1998a), *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley*, *California* (USFWS 1998b), *Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills* (USFWS 2002d), and *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005). (2 points)

5. *Develop a public outreach and education program in the Merced and Madera Core Areas for vernal pool species identified in the Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005). The program should include classroom curricula and outdoor activities for grade school students in school districts in Merced County, to introduce them to vernal pool ecosystems and the species they support. Proposals should reference existing vernal pool outreach programs, such as the Sacramento Splash program in Sacramento County, and emphasize coordination with local schools and universities in Merced County. Curriculum topics should include the biology of vernal pool species, the ecology of vernal pools, and the importance of watersheds. Proposals must identify specific areas to be used for outdoor activities over a period of at least 5 years (with proof of landowner approval), identify staff that will oversee the initial development and establishment of the program, and identify the party or parties that will continue to oversee and fund the project after initial establishment. To ensure successful implementation of the proposed program in school curricula, proposals will only be reviewed that are accompanied by letters of support from applicable school principals and/or school district superintendants. Funding requests for a single proposal are not to exceed $25,000. (1 point)

6. Other captive breeding, management, and outreach activities that address CVPCP/HRP goals of protecting, enhancing, and restoring CVP impacted federally listed species populations and their habitats within the CVPCP/HRP project area map boundary. See the CVPCP and HRP website for priority habitat types and species included in these programs: http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/species/index.html. As applicable, proposals must emphasize priority one and two tasks found in the USFWS Recovery Plans associated with the species and habitats to be benefitted by the proposed action. (0 point)

LITERATURE CITED

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. 1998c. Draft Recovery Plan for Least Bell's Vireo. Portland, Oregon.

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. Southwestern Willow Flycatcher Recovery Plan. Portland, Oregon.

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2005. Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon. Portland, Oregon. xxvi + 606 pp.

V.D. EXPLANATION PROGRAM RANKING CRITERIA

Proposals received by the CVPCP and HRP are placed into the four activity categories described in section I.E.: Land Acquisition, Restoration, Research, and Captive Breeding/Management/Outreach. Some or all of the criteria described below are applied to those categories, but no other criteria, other than those listed below, are used.

V.D.1 *CRITERION #1 - ELIGIBILITY TO RANK*

FOR LAND ACQUISITION (EASEMENT AND/OR FEE TITLE) PROPOSALS
This criterion considers whether or not the proposal merits evaluation and ranking. The technical team will determine this by considering, at a minimum, the following: 1) the proposal's geographic area, which must be within the CVPCP/HRP Priority Project Area boundary line, or otherwise has a clear CVP connection 2) conformance with the FOA, and 3) past performance of the project applicant. For example, for conformance with the FOA, the technical team will consider whether or not the proposal meets the goals and objectives of the CVPCP and HRP, etc. For past performance, the technical team 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; communication and coordination on past projects between themselves and the granting agency; complied with the terms and conditions of the previous grant agreement; whether the grant recipient was responsive to requested information; etc.

For proposals for land acquisition, the parcel(s) to be acquired must be identified in the proposal, and the willing seller(s) of the parcel(s) identified. Funds to be provided through this announcement are for the specific parcel(s) identified in the proposal. No replacement lands will be funded should the land identified in the proposal no longer be available for acquisition. For the acquisition of a conservation easement, successful applicants must submit a draft conservation easement to the CVPCP and/or HRP Program Manager for review and concurrence prior to completion of the appraisal.

FOR RESTORATION AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/OUTREACH PROPOSALS
This criterion considers whether or not the proposal merits evaluation and ranking. The technical team will determine this by considering the following: 1) conformance with the FOA, and 2) past performance of the project applicant. For example, for conformance with the FOA, the technical team will consider whether or not the proposal meets the goals and objectives of the CVPCP and HRP, etc. For past performance, the technical team will consider how well the project applicant, as a previous grant recipient, complied with submitting invoices, reports, and other requested information (*e.g.*, Progress Report, Draft Report, Final Report) for previous projects in a complete and timely manner; communication and coordination on past projects between themselves and the granting agency; compliance with the terms and conditions of the previous grant agreement; and whether the

recipient was responsive to requested information; etc.

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This criterion considers whether or not the proposal merits evaluation and ranking. The technical team will determine this by considering the following: 1) conformance with the FOA, 2) past performance of the project applicant, and 3) results of the technical review. For example, for conformance with the FOA, the technical team will consider whether or not the proposal meets the goals and objectives of the CVPCP and HRP, etc. For past performance, the technical team will consider how well the project applicant, as a previous grant recipient, complied with submitting invoices, reports, and other requested information (*e.g.*, Progress Report, Draft Report, Final Report) for previous projects in a complete and timely manner; communication and coordination on past projects between themselves and the granting agency; compliance with the terms and conditions of the previous grant agreement; whether the recipient was responsive to requested information; etc. Concerning technical reviews, all research proposals will be subjected to additional scrutiny by being evaluated by experts in the scientific community on the various research topics that are received. Please see Attachment B for the Evaluation Form that will be filled out by these reviewers for each Research proposal.

V.D.2 *CRITERION #2 - CVP NEXUS*

FOR ACQUISITION, RESEARCH, RESTORATION AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS

The criterion considers whether a "nexus" (relationship or connection) 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? See website for CVPCP and HRP Project Area Map (http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/).
>
> 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 habitats and/or species clearly exists.

This factor is especially valuable to Reclamation because it provides a higher level of assurance to CVP 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 ESA 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.

V.D.3 *CRITERION #3 - PROGRAM PRIORITY ACTION*

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, RESEARCH AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS

This criterion addresses a proposal's relationship to the annual Priority Actions 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 Priority Actions based in part on past expenditures and existing needs. A proposal that addresses needs within these Priority Actions will be ranked accordingly, with proposals in higher priority areas receiving more points than those in lower priority areas. Priority Actions, and the corresponding pre-assigned number of points, are indicated in Section I.E of this FOA.

V.D.4 *CRITERION #4 - 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.** Please see the following link for a list of federally listed endangered and threatened animals of California:
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/TEAnimals.pdf
Please see the following link for a list of federally listed endangered and threatened plants of California: http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/TEPlants.pdf

FOR ACQUISITION PROPOSALS

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? Parcels proposed for acquisition or restoration having documented occurrences of federally listed species will likely rank higher than those that do not. Applicants must define the existing baseline conditions for federally listed species that are known or suspected to inhabit the project area that can be expected to benefit from the acquisition, and how that baseline is expected to be maintained or improved as a result of the project. It is insufficient to merely provide a table or list of species that are present in the vicinity of the proposed acquisition. Applicants should name the species that are expected to benefit, either directly or indirectly, and in what way the species will be benefitted.

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.")

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 or any number of critically endangered 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 or species are not known to be present; land is not comprised of designated critical habitat; and land is subject to moderate to high disturbance from adjacent lands.

FOR RESTORATION PROPOSALS

For restoration projects, a **major** benefit would result when the reviewers determine that the restoration action has the potential to markedly raise the habitat or population 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 (i.e., for 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, but 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 elderberry will be planted in areas and densities where it is unlikely to result in colonization by valley elderberry longhorn beetles). A clear description of the area to be restored, and how success in gaining access will be established, is important in determining benefits to species. Applicants should define the existing baseline conditions for federally listed species that are known or suspected to inhabit the project area that can be expected to benefit from the restoration, and how that baseline is expected to be maintained or improved as a result of the project. It is insufficient to merely provide a table or list of species that are present in the vicinity of the project area. Applicants should name the species that are expected to benefit, either directly or indirectly, and in what way the species will be benefitted.

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

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. Projects must provide a clear and detailed methodology in order for benefits to be accurately determined. If the proposal describes actions on private lands, it is important to convey how success in gaining access will be established and what effect it will have on the research if access is not granted.

FOR CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/OUTREACH PROPOSALS

Proposals are ranked based on the scope and effectiveness of the project. A **major** benefit would be an effort that addresses numerous listed species and has the potential to significantly improve conditions for species over the long term. An extensive project that addresses numerous species, or focuses effectively on critically endangered species, would also receive a **major** ranking. A **moderate** ranking would be applied to a project that provides significant benefit but which is limited in scope (# of species) and benefit. A **minimal** ranking would be applied to a project that address few, if any, listed species and is so limited in scope that no significant benefits would be realized over the long term.

V.D.5 *CRITERION #5 - STATE LISTED SPECIES BENEFITS*

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS

This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have benefits to State listed species in addition to any other kind of ecological benefit. Parcels proposed for acquisition or restoration, which have documented occurrences of State listed species will likely rank higher than those that do not. See descriptions under the “Federally Listed Species” section, since those types of benefits would similarly apply to State listed species. Please see the following link for a list of State listed Endangered and Threatened animals of California:
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/TEAnimals.pdf

Please see the following link for a list of State listed Endangered, Threatened, Rare (plants), Candidate, and Fully Protected Species of California:
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/biogeodata/cnddb/pdfs/TEPlants.pdf.

V.D.6 *CRITERION #6 – OTHER DESIGNATED SPECIES BENEFITS*

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS
This criterion is used to distinguish between projects that have benefits to species which have some type of State or Federal designated status, but which are not State or federally *listed* (or federally proposed) species. These include Federal Candidate Species and State Species of Special Concern. See descriptions under the "Federally Listed Species" section, since those types of benefits would similarly apply to other designated species. Please see the following link for Federal Candidate Species:
http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/pub/stateListingIndividual.jsp?state=CA&status=candidate

V.D.7 *CRITERION #7- HABITAT/BIODIVERSITY*

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/OUTREACH PROPOSALS ONLY
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.

V.D.8 *CRITERION #8 - CUMULATIVE BENEFIT*

FOR ACQUISITION PROPOSALS
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., the habitat is used incidentally for foraging).

FOR RESTORATION PROPOSALS
An example of projects with **major** cumulative benefits 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).

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

An example of a project with **major** cumulative benefits 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).

FOR CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/OUTREACH PROPOSALS

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 project where the recipient is working in conjunction with a larger comprehensive effort to provide important benefits to listed species and/or habitats, or which would cause those efforts to be significantly enhanced. A **moderate** benefit would be a project that works in conjunction with other more moderate (or fewer) ongoing efforts. A **minimal** benefit would result when a project occurs more or less in isolation and would not be complemented by other on-going efforts.

V.D.9 *CRITERION* #9 - LONG-TERM BENEFIT

FOR ACQUISITION AND RESTORATION PROPOSALS

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.

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

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).

FOR CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/OUTREACH PROPOSALS
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.

V.D.10 *CRITERION #10* - PROJECT SITE CONNECTIVITY

FOR ACQUISITION AND RESTORATION PROPOSALS ONLY
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.

V.D.11 *CRITERION #11* - PARTNERS

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS
This criterion gives credit for contributions of cash and/or in-kind services obtained from one or more sources that facilitate the completion of the proposed project, expressed as a percentage of the total cost of the project. Information on the amount and nature of each partner contribution must be provided in order for partnering levels to be ascertained and credited. Project proponents must specify the following in their proposals: (1) the name of each partner contributing cash or in-kind contribution toward the total cost of the project (other than the CVPCP/HRP), and (2) the amount to be contributed by each of those partners. Project applicants are also required to equate in-kind services to dollars or those 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. However, prior year contributions to the project on the part of the CVPCP/HRP will not be considered a partner contribution when ranking the proposal. Failure to secure partner funds from sources specified in the proposal may jeopardize the delivery of funds under a CVPCP/HRP agreement.

Critical to the evaluation of the CVPCP/HRP proposal is an adequate identification of committed or potential funding partners. Applicants are expected to name the funding partners and the extent of their discussions with, and financial commitment from, the partners described in the proposal. For example, it is not adequate to merely name as a partner "a State grant program." It's not expected that all partner contributions be committed at the time of the submission of the application, but the

CVPCP/HRP Technical Team evaluating the proposal needs to know that the named partnership contribution is real. Partners to the project who are not providing a financial contribution to the project, either directly or in-kind, are not considered in the proposal ranking or project selection.

Project applicants are highly encouraged to seek other sources of funding along with funding from the CVPCP and/or HRP.

V.D.12 *CRITERION #12* - LEVEL OF CVP IMPACTS

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS

This criterion measures and assesses to what extent a species or ecosystem has been affected by the CVP. 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 Priority Actions" section but is ranked separately since priority actions 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 criterion, 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.

V.D.13 *CRITERION #13* - PROJECT URGENCY

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS

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 described in the proposal are not carried out.

V.D.14 *CRITERION #14* - TECHNICAL MERIT AND COMPLETENESS OF PROPOSAL

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS

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; the quality of maps and tables; how well the proposal addresses the ranking criteria; how well the proposal package adhered to the required format; and the quality and completeness of the description of the project monitoring and management plan (as applicable). In addition to being reviewed and ranked by the CVPCP & HRP Technical Team, research proposals will be forwarded to scientific experts in the field of research pertinent to the species and/or habitats central to the proposal so that the proposal can be reviewed for technical accuracy. For research proposals, the methodology must be clearly and completely described.

V.D.15 *CRITERION #15* – SCIENTIFIC MERIT

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This criterion considers the scientific rigor of the proposed project. The proposal will be evaluated on its scientific soundness, appropriateness of methods, cohesiveness of argument, organization and clarity of methods (statistical design and analysis), and length relative to information content. This evaluation will take into account supplemental technical "peer" reviews provided to the ranking team.

A **high** rank will be awarded to concise proposals with exceptional scientific soundness and clearly described and appropriate methods. A **moderate** rank will be assigned to proposals with minor methodological flaws or lack of clarity, but the proposal will be scientifically sound. A **low** rank will be assigned to proposals with significant methodological flaws, flawed reasoning, and/or extensive lack of clarity.

IV.D.16 *CRITERION #16* - ACRES

FOR ACQUISITION AND RESTORATION PROPOSALS ONLY

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

V.D.17 *CRITERION #17* - CVPCP/HRP COST

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS

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.

V.D.18 *CRITERION #18* - TOTAL COST

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS

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.

V.D.19 *CRITERION #19* - TOTAL POINTS

FOR ACQUISITION, RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE BREEDING/MANAGEMENT/ OUTREACH PROPOSALS

This sums all points received for the evaluation and ranking criteria for a particular proposal in a particular activity category. Because not all of the evaluation and ranking criteria apply to each of the activity categories, each activity category may have a unique total potential number of points, and as a consequence proposals are evaluated and ranked within activity categories. Total points are evaluated in the context of General Considerations, as specified in Section III.D.

SECTION VI – AWARD ADMINISTRATION INFORMATION

VI.A AWARD NOTICES

Successful applicants will receive a notice of award of a Grant, Cooperative, or Interagency Agreement document by mail, signed by a Grants Officer, notifying the applicant of the project award amount by May 2011. Unsuccessful applicants will also be notified by mail. Notification is sent to the official who signs the SF 424.

Successful applicants will be notified as soon as possible upon selection. However, note that contracting and environmental compliance requirements can take a substantial amount of time to be completed. **Applicants should not expect to begin project work before the beginning of Fiscal Year 2012 (October 1, 2011).**

VI.B AWARD DOCUMENT

If your organization is awarded an agreement, the applicable portions of Sections II, III, IV and VII of your proposal submitted under this FOA 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 FOA, you will be required to submit the following types of reports during the term of the agreement.

VI.C.1. Financial Reports

- SF-425, Financial Status Report, (available at http://www.usbr.gov/mso/aamd/doing-business-financial-assistance.html

VI.C.2. Program Performance Reports

- Quarterly or Semi-Annual Performance Progress Reports
- Annual Reports
- Draft (Final) Report
- Final Report

VI.C.3. Significant Developments Reports

During the term of the agreement, the Recipient must immediately notify the Programs if any

of the following conditions occur:

a) Problems, delays, or adverse conditions which will impair the Recipient's ability to meet the terms and conditions of the agreement;
b) Favorable developments which will enable the Recipient to complete the scope of work under budget and/or under an accelerated schedule.

This notification is to include information on the actions taken or contemplated to resolve problems, delays, or adverse conditions, and any assistance needed from Reclamation/Service to help resolve the problem.

VI.C.4. Data Reports

For research projects, any raw data, and the analytical tools to help process the raw data, will be included in the Final Reports. For recipients subject to the administrative standards set forth in OMB Circular A-110, the following provision, as implemented by 43 CFR 12 936(c), shall apply:

The Federal Government has the right to:
(1) Obtain, reproduce, publish or otherwise use the data first produced under an award; and
(2) Authorize others to receive, reproduce, publish, or otherwise use such data for Federal purposes.

Geospatial Information System Data Report

For all projects in which lands are acquired or restored, and for research projects where there will be a GIS product, grant recipients must send to the CVPCP and/or HRP Program Managers information on the location of the land in geospatial/GIS format using Attachment D, **Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Service Metadata Form**. The preferred format in which the data should be provided is as an ESRI shape file (*.shp) projected in Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM), North American Datum (NAD) 83, consistent with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service GIS needs and standards 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 Attachment D*).

VI.C.5. Published Reports

Where data warrant, results from Research Projects should be published and a copy submitted to the CVPCP and HRP. Recipients of grant funding are encouraged to submit their accomplishments and findings for publication.

SECTION VII -- OTHER INFORMATION

Please note that all contracts for projects that are funded by the CVPCP and/or HRP cannot extend past 5 years.

VII.A. STANDARD TERMS & CONDITIONS

If you are awarded a Grant or Cooperative Agreement as a result of this Request for Funding Opportunity, 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/doing-business-financial-assistance.html.

VII.B. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT (FOIA)

All applications may be subject to FOIA. The Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C.A. §552) generally provides that any person has a right, enforceable in court, to obtain access to federal agency records, except to the extent that such records (or portions of them) are protected from public disclosure by one of nine exemptions or by one of three special law enforcement record exclusions. Proprietary information should be marked "Confidential" to assist in alerting the federal agency to information that may be protected from disclosure.

VII.C. DUNS REQUIREMENT. All applicants applying for funding must have a Dun and Bradstreet Universal Data Numbering System (DUNS) number. The DUNS number must be included in the data entry field labeled "Organizational Duns" on the form SF-424. Instructions for obtaining a DUNS number can be found at the following website: http://fedgov.dnb.com/webform/displayHomePage.do.

VII.D. CENTRAL CONTRACTOR REGISTRY AND CREDENTIAL PROVIDER REGISTRATION. In addition to having a DUNS number, applicants must register with the Federal Central Contractor Registry and with a Credential Provider. The website at http://www.grants.gov/GetStarted provides step-by-step instructions for registering in the Central Contractor Registry and for registering with a credential provider.

The registration process is a separate process from submitting an application. **Applicants are, therefore, encouraged to register early**. The registration process can take approximately two weeks to be completed. Therefore, registration should be done in sufficient time to ensure it does not impact your ability to meet required submission deadlines. If you are filing electronically on grants.gov, you may be able to submit your application anytime after you receive your e-authentication credentials.

ATTACHMENT A

Example of Species Table – This table should be used as a template by applicants for the Federal, State, and Other Designated Species criteria.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status[a]	State Status[b]	Other Designated Species[c]	Species Verified Presence (Y/N)[d]
Plants Palmate-bracted bird's beak	*Cordylanthus palmatus*	E	E		
Hairy orcutt grass	*Orcuttia pilosa*	E	E		
Greene's tuctoria	*Tuctoria greenei*	E	R		
Hoover's spurge	*Chamaesyce hooveri*	T			
Invertebrates Vernal pool tadpole shrimp	*Lepidurus packardi*	E			
Conservancy fairy shrimp	*Branchinecta conservatio*	E			
Vernal pool fairy shrimp	*Branchinecta lynchi*	T			
Reptiles Giant garter snake	*Thamnophis gigas*	T	T		
Western pond turtle	*Clemmys marmorata*			CSC	
Birds Bald eagle	*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*	delisted	E		
Swainson's hawk	*Buteo swainsoni*		T		
White-tailed kite	*Elanus leucurus*			FP	
Burrowing owl	*Athene cunicularia*			CSC	
White-faced ibis	*Plegadis chihi*			CSC	
Long-billed curlew	*Numenius americanus*			CSC	
Loggerhead shrike	*Lanius ludovicianus*			CSC	
Tricolored blackbird	*Agelaius tricolor*			CSC	

[a]E = federally listed as endangered, T= federally listed as threatened, P=federally proposed for listing
[b]E = state listed as endangered, R = state listed as rare, T = state listed as threatened, C = state listed as candidate
[c]C=federally listed as candidate, CSC = California species of special concern, FP = California fully protected species
[d]This list should be on the *actual property/parcel* that is being proposed for protection and/or restoration, not just the general geographic area.

ATTACHMENT B

EVALUATION FORM FOR TECHNICAL REVIEW OF RESEARCH PROPOSALS RECEIVED FOR THE CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT CONSERVATION PROGRAM (CVPCP) AND CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT IMPROVEMENT ACT (CVPIA) HABITAT RESTORATON PROGRAM (HRP)

I. Name of Project: _____

II. Project Number: _____

III. Name of Reviewer: _____

IV. Date of Review: _____

V. Questions to Answer: (please check the "N/A", "Yes", "No", or "Needs modification" box for each question)

LIST OF QUESTIONS TO ANSWER	N/A	Yes	No (Describe in Comments)	Needs modification (Describe in Comments)
1. Are the study's objectives and hypotheses clear and sufficiently detailed?				
2. Is the literature cited by the researcher relevant and extensive enough to support research objectives, hypotheses, assumptions, research methodologies, and planned analyses?				
3. Is the conceptual framework, including the study design and analyses, adequately developed, well-integrated, well-reasoned, and appropriate to the aims of the project?				
4. Are the field and/or laboratory techniques and methods identified in the proposal acceptable and in-keeping with current standards?				
5. Is the proposed execution of methods satisfactory? For example, if the study utilizes samples or transects, are the number, location, and size sufficient and is the frequency/duration/seasonal timing of sampling adequate?				
6. Are proposed statistical analyses in-keeping with current standards?				
7. Is the project original and innovative? (i.e., does the project avoid duplication, employ novel concepts, approaches, methodologies, tools, or technologies for the focal species and/or area?)				
8. Do the personnel involved in the research/study have sufficient qualifications (academic and field experience) to carry out the work?				
9. Does the investigative team bring complementary and integrated expertise to the project?				
10. Is there evidence of institutional support?				
11. Do the proposed study schedule and budget seem				

reasonable?				

VI. Comments: Briefly summarize the strengths and weaknesses of the proposal and suggest any modifications or improvements that must be made in order to recommend this study for funding. Discuss any problem areas, alternatives to be considered, and/or adequacy in fulfilling study objectives per the proposed schedule and budget. If an element(s) needs modification, please cite the corresponding question number from above, and describe your suggested modification.

ATTACHMENT C

Sample Budget Table

BUDGET ITEM DESCRIPTION	COMPUTATION		RECIPIENT FUNDING	OTHER FUNDING	CVPCP/HRP FUNDING	TOTAL COST
	$/Unit and Unit	Quantity				
1. SALARIES AND WAGES --Position title x hourly wage/salary x est. hours for assisted activity. Describe this information for each position.						
i.e. Manager	$50/hr.	100	$2,500		$2,500	5,000.00
2. FRINGE BENEFITS – Explain the type of fringe benefits and how are they applied to various categories of personnel.						
i.e. 20% applies to all personnel	20%		$2,000			$2,000.00
3. TRAVEL—dates; location of travel; method of travel x estimated cost; who will travel						
i.e. mileage	.50	2000 mi	$500.00		$500.00	$1,000.00
4. EQUIPMENT—Leased Equipment use rate + hourly wage/salary x est. hours for assisted activity—Describe equipment to be purchased, unit price, # of units for all equipment to be purchased or leased for assisted activity: Do not list contractor supplied equipment here.						
i.e. Excavator	$165	76	$11,000.00		$1,540.00	$12,540.00
5. SUPPLIES/MATERIALS--Describe all major types of supplies/materials, unit price, # of units, etc., to be used on this assisted activity.						
6. CONTRACTUAL/ CONSTRUCTION—Explain any contracts or sub-Agreements that will be awarded, why needed. Explain contractor qualifications and how the contractor will be selected.						
i.e. Engineering Consultant	$48,000/L.S.	1	$48,000		$ 48,000	$96,000.00
i.e. Furnish and Install 48B50 RCP pipe	$90/L.F.	2,000		$180,000	$180,000	$360,000.00
7. ENVIRONMENTAL and REGULATORY COMPLIANCE COSTS – Reference cost incurred by the CVPCP/HRP or the applicant in complying with environmental regulations applicable to this Program, which include NEPA, ESA, NHPA etc.						
8. OTHER –List any other cost elements necessary for your project; such as extra reporting, or contingencies in a construction contract.						
i.e. Construction contingencies	10%		$40,750		$40,750	$81,500.00
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS--						
9. INDIRECT COSTS - What is the percentage rate**% .** If you do not have a Federally-approved Indirect Cost Rate Agreement or if unapproved rates are used - Explain Why.						
TOTAL PROJECT/ACTIVITY COSTS						

Sources of Funding

Recipient
- Cash:_____
- In-Kind Services:_____

Partner (1) _____
- Cash:_____
- In-Kind Services:_____

Partner (2) _____
- Cash:_____
- In-Kind Services:_____

CVPCP/HRP:_____

Total Activity Funding:_____

ATTACHMENT D

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