BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

and

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Pacific Southwest Region

Funding Opportunity Application No. R12AF20001

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

Fiscal Year 2012

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/

October 2011

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.:	R12AF20001
Application Due Date:	Applications due **December 9, 2011**, 2:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time (PST)
Eligible Applicants:	As described in Section III.A and III.D.
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 (U.S. 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.9 , Program Ranking Criteria, Criterion #9-"Partners"
Estimated number of agreements to be awarded	10 – 15. Funds may range from $25,000 to $1,000,000 on approved projects.
Total amount of funding available for FY12:	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	6-8
Section IV	Application and Proposal Submission Information	8-18
Section V	Application Review Information	18-33
Section VI	Award Administration Information	33-35
Section VII	Other Information	35
Attachment A	Example of Species Table	36
Attachment B	Evaluation Form for Technical Review	37-38
Attachment C	Sample Budget Table	39
Literature Cited		40

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. It is also in the applicant's best interest to check each box to make certain they have submitted every required form and completely followed the required format. **Failure to submit all forms and follow the format may render the proposal ineligible.**

REQUIRED CONTENT	REQUIRED FORM OR FORMAT		CHECK BOX WHEN COMPLETED (for Applicant only)
Cover Page	Sec. IV.C.1.	Name of Requestor, Organization Name, Title of Proposed 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 proposed 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.	
Landowner/ Access Approval	Sec. V.A.1 V.A.2	Applicants must provide evidence of landowner support.	
*FORMS MAY BE DOWNLOADED FROM WWW.GRANTS.GOV UNDER THE FUNDING OPPORTUNITY, R12AF20001, 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 under the "Fish and Wildlife Restoration Activities" section. The HRP also implements actions to improve conditions for species impacted by the CVP.

I.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; the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, 16 U.S.C 742(a-j); and the Central Valley Project Improvement Act of 1992, Public Law No. 102-575, Title XXXIV, Section 3406(b)(1).

I.C PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of the CVPCP and HRP for FY 2012 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 would 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, excluding fish, 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. For FY 2012, land acquisition projects will have the highest priority, followed by restoration, research, and captive propagation and reintroduction projects as described below:

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. At least 50 percent of CVPCP and HRP funds will be targeted towards this

activity.

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

3) Research: Research addressing status and habitat needs to facilitate species recovery.

4) Captive Propagation and Reintroduction: Captive propagation and reintroduction of listed species in order to increase numbers of individuals in a population.

SECTION II -- AWARD INFORMATION

II.A PROJECT FUNDING LIMITATIONS

The number of agreements awarded is dependent on the number of successful proposals, and the amount of funding available to the programs for fiscal year 2012. Total estimated funding for the program for fiscal year 2012 is $3,000,000. U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife (Service) funds may range from $25,000 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 agreement.

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 2012 on whether or not their proposal(s) was selected for funding. It is anticipated that awards will be made by **September 2012**.

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 are not eligible to submit a proposal under this FOA. Interested federal agencies should contact the Program Managers about how to apply for funding, such as through a third party.

III.B COST SHARE GUIDELINES

There is no cost sharing requirement, but partnering (i.e., cost sharing provided by entities which are contributing financially towards the proposed project) is highly encouraged and the level of partnering is considered during proposal evaluation. Refer to the ranking guidelines in Section V.D., Explanation of Proposal Evaluation and Ranking Process - Criterion #9, "Partners" for more information.

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

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 or cooperative agreements might weigh against further funding, and can disqualify an applicant from receiving program funding.

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

III.E SUBMISSION DEADLINE and LOCATION for SUBMISSION:

The submission deadline is December 9, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. PST. The proposal application should be mailed or hand-delivered to **Vivian Davis**, **MP-3827**, 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. Proposed 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.,"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 urged 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 are encountered 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.

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 Reclamation's Grants Officer:

E-mail: vdavis@usbr.gov

Mail:
Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region
Attn: Vivian Davis, MP-3827
2800 Cottage Way, Room E-1815
Sacramento CA 95825-1898

IV.A.2 Applicants are encouraged to contact the CVPCP and HRP Program Managers if they have questions about how to submit a proposal. 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 95825-1846
(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 SF 424, Application for Federal Assistance, may contact Vivian Davis at (916) 978-5543 or via email at vdavis@usbr.gov

IV.B INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBMISSION OF PROJECT PROPOSALS

IV.B.1. Submit one original and three paper copies of the proposal in loose-leaf format (i.e., not stapled or bound in any way), and an electronic copy on a CD. Proposals should be in Microsoft Word format. 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 FOA number R12AF20001. **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 Proposed 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: Vivian Davis, MP-3827
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 December 9, 2011. 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 proposed 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 R12AF20001, Full Announcement or Application.**

IV.C.2.1. Executive Order 12372 (E.O. 12372) – The SF 424 is subject to review by the State Executive Order 12372, "Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs". One copy of the application cover form (SF 424) must be mailed to the State Clearinghouse, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, P.O. Box 3044, Sacramento, CA 95812. The State also accepts fax copies of the SF 424 at (916) 323-3018. Applicants should not send or fax the full application package or any other supplemental information to the State Clearinghouse. Be sure to mark the SF 424 correctly; check the box and indicate the date that the SF 424 was faxed or mailed to the State Clearinghouse on Section 19 of the SF 424.

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, R12AF20001, Full Announcement or Application.**

IV.C.4. Proposal Submission Guidelines and Format

It is highly recommended that applicants 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 SF 424s, 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 be included after the main text of the proposal, be individually numbered, and clearly titled.

Margins should be 1 inch on each side, top and bottom. Font size should be Times New Roman 12 pt. There should be 1.5 spaces between lines.

Applicants should submit well described and technically accurate proposal packages organized to address the following required information for each section in the order indicated below:

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

IV.C.4.2. Abstract: Submit a brief abstract in standard abstract format (i.e., no more than one page).

IV.C.4.3. Proposal Category: List the category of the project activity, e.g., Land Acquisition, Habitat Restoration, Research, or Captive Propagation and Reintroduction..

IV.C.4.4. Project Objective(s): Clearly state the objective(s) that the proposed project would 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 Proposed Project: All project proposals must include a clear, detailed, full-page color map indicating local reference points, a scale bar, 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/map/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 as well as longitude and latitude information.

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

IV.C.4.8. Total Proposed 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 (i.e., riparian woodland, upland, vernal pools, etc.) and the number of acres of each of these habitat types that would be acquired or restored if funded (**for acquisition or restoration proposals only**).
- Provide enough information about potential effects from the proposed 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 habitat 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 proposed 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 only)**.
- If the project requires more than 1 year of work, the applicant should state this; list tasks for each phase; and separate tasks by each year.
- Answer the question: Why is this project needed?

IV.C.4.10. Proposed 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 proposed project site. Show the locations of these occurrences on the project location map, especially verified Federal and State listed species occurrences and/or habitats. 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. Monitoring and Management: Unless otherwise required, 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 CVPCP/HRP are intended to achieve. Proposals for land acquisition and habitat restoration should state how the protected and/or restored habitats would be monitored and managed in the future in order to achieve the benefits to the CVP-impacted species and habitats described in the proposal. Describe any existing land management plans for which the program goals would be accomplished and carried forward in the future, or how and when such plans would 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 proposed 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.4.13. Measuring Results: Describe how project performance would be measured when assessing the progress made (actual) towards achieving the predetermined performance goals (baseline). Examples of project performance that could be measured are: numbers of individuals detected during pre- and post-project surveys for acquisition and restoration projects, qualitative improvements in habitat conditions from pre- to post-restoration, quantitative changes in acres of each habitat type from pre- to post-acquisition and restoration, number of individuals successfully propagated during captive breeding, etc.

IV.C.4.14. Department of Interior Landscape Conservation Cooperative: All applicants are requested to address how their proposed project would contribute to the goals and objectives of the Department of Interior's (DOI) California Landscape Conservation Cooperative (LCC), the foundation 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.californialcc.org/*

IV.C.4.15. Resume: Provide a one-page résumé or curriculum vitae for each person who would be significantly involved in the proposed project.

IV.C.4.16. Relationship of Proposal to Program Ranking Criteria:
Each proposal will be ranked by the CVPCP/HRP technical team using a total of as many as 13 Program Ranking Criteria. Section V.C lists these criteria and shows the range of points that are given for each criterion. Of the 13 criteria, described below are those which the applicant must address according to the category of proposal being submitted (Land Acquisition, Habitat Restoration, Research, or Captive Propagation and Reintroduction). **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.** More detailed guidelines for each ranking criterion are described in Section V.D., "Explanation of Proposal Evaluation and Ranking Process."

- 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 number and which

category (Land Acquisition, Habitat Restoration, Research, or Captive Propagation and Reintroduction) that the proposal addresses, and describe how the project relates to the Priority Action. **The Program Priority Actions are fully described in Section V.A of this FOA.**

- Federally Listed Species (includes species proposed for listing): The proposal must indicate in as much detail as possible how the project would benefit federally Endangered or Threatened species, excluding fish, including species Proposed for listing, and how many and which species would benefit. Define and document existing baseline conditions related to federally listed and proposed 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 recognized species experts or others 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 would address species' recovery plan tasks, which recovery plan tasks are addressed, and state whether designated "critical habitat" includes the project area. It is highly encouraged that status surveys be conducted prior to submitting a proposal.

- State Listed Species: The proposal must indicate how State Endangered, Threatened, Rare (plants), Candidate, and Fully Protected species, excluding fish, may benefit from the proposed 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**.

- Federal or State Species that are not Listed and not Proposed for Listing: The proposal must describe how other imperiled CVP impacted species, excluding fish, that are not listed, or proposed for Federal or State listing, may benefit from the proposed 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.** Federal or State species that are not listed and proposed for listing include Federal Candidate Species, State Species of Special Concern, and California Native Plant Society (CNPS) designated species.

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

- Cumulative Benefit: The proposal must indicate how the project would contribute to past or on-going activities related to the same species or habitats, including past CVPCP/HRP-funded projects.

- Long-term Benefit: The proposal must address how the project benefits might persist or increase over time, i.e., describe the future benefits to species and habitats that are expected to result from the proposed project.

- Project Site Connectivity: If applicable, the proposal must describe how the project site location is physically connected (i.e., immediately adjacent) to another protected or restored parcel. **For Acquisition and Restoration proposals only.**

- Partners: This criterion gives credit to financial contributions of cash and/or the equivalent in-kind service obtained from one or more sources that would facilitate the completion of the proposed project, expressed as a percentage of the total cost of the project, which would offset costs that would otherwise be paid for by the CVPCP/HRP. Information on the amount and

nature of each partner contribution must be provided in order for partnering levels to be ascertained and credited. The proposal must include partner contributions in the SF-424, budget narrative and the budget table. For the budget table, applicants should refer to and use the template format shown in Appendix C. Project applicants must incorporate the following in the budget table and budget narrative of their proposals: (1) the name of each partner contributing cash or in-kind contributions toward the total cost of the project (other than the CVPCP/HRP), (2) the amount to be contributed by each of those partners as cash or equivalent dollars, as well as percentage of the total project cost, and (3) a partner contribution must have a direct link to the current project being proposed. Proposals must equate in-kind services to dollars or those services will not be considered when partnering points are tallied. Partner cost sharing will only be considered for components that make up the proposed project. Funds expended on the proposed project prior to receiving the CVPCP/HRP grant award will not be considered when awarding points under this category. 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.

For help with the entire budget table and budget narrative, 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 to benefit from the proposed project was impacted by the CVP.

- Project Urgency: The proposal must assign a level 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 the statement of urgency 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 Officer, 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 as much of the necessary information and data analyses as possible in order for the agencies to complete NEPA and other regulatory compliance in a timely manner. This information may include

specifics about site disturbance, presence of listed species, archeological sites, past or on-going surveys, etc. No work on approved projects may begin until all compliance and substantiating documents are completed.

For research on and captive breeding of animals, recipients must comply with the Laboratory Animal Welfare Act of 1966 (Public Law 89-544), as amended, (7 U.S.C. §§ 2131 et seq.) (animal acquisition, transport, care, handling, and use in projects), and implementing regulations, 9 CFR Parts 1, 2, and 3; the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1531 et seq.); Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1361 et seq.) (taking possession, transport, purchase, sale, export or import of wildlife and plants); The Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 4701 et seq.) (ensure preventive measures are taken or that probable harm of using species is minimal if there is an escape or release); and all other applicable statutes pertaining to the care, handling, and treatment of animals held for research, teaching, or other activities supported by Federal financial assistance.

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.

How environmental and regulatory compliance costs are to be fulfilled 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, **R12AF20001**, 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, not only the CVPCP/HRP requested funds). **More information is provided in Section V.D.9 "*CRITERION #9* – PARTNERS."**

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 proposed 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 39.

The basis of all costs in the SF 424 and proposed budget must be documented and defensible in order for the CVPCP/HRP Technical Team 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 and the proposal project budget, 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 would 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 would 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 would 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 applicant's organization. It is not acceptable to simply incorporate indirect rates within other direct cost line items.

If the applicant 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 the applicant does 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 proposed 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 FISCAL YEAR 2012 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 2012 and are listed in four categories below: Land Acquisition, Habitat Restoration, Research, and Captive Propagation and Reintroduction. Well-conceived and clearly written proposals must address the Priority Actions. 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 Sections V.C and V.D.1 Criterion #1, 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. Successful completion of the project, and all deliverables resulting from the grant, should not be dependent upon future funding by the CVPCP and/or HRP.

V.A.1. Land Acquisition Priority Actions

Parcels proposed for fee title or conservation easement acquisition having 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) Office of Valuation Services (OVS) to ensure appraisals meet DOI standards. Appraisals submitted without DOI/OVS guidance will most likely not be approved**. Additionally, the parcel(s) to be acquired and evidence of landowner support must be identified in the proposal, and the willing seller(s) of the parcel(s) identified. Furthermore, the Program Managers and/or Technical Team have the discretion to consider the overall percentage of the area being proposed for acquisition that is habitat for federally listed species, i.e., the number of acres of CVP impacted species habitats as a percentage of the total number of acres proposed for acquisition will be a factor in project selection. Finally, the applicant must identify any known encumbrances on the parcel to be acquired such as existing access easements, severed mineral rights, etc.

1. *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 ornate shrew, federally-listed plant species, particularly California jewelflower, palmate-bracted bird's beak, Kern mallow, San Joaquin woolly-threads, Hartweg's golden sunburst, and Bakersfield cactus and other species dependent upon this habitat complex. For the kit fox, areas receiving priority consideration for land acquisition are the Panoche and Pleasant Valley areas, lands north of Carrizo Plain National Monument, western Fresno County, western Madera County, and areas around Santa Nella, Los Banos and Tracy where

linkages between occupied habitats are in danger of being lost. Proposals should 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). (9 points)

2. *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 existing habitat and provide for the protection and management of occupied habitats 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 should 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). (7 points)

3. *Vernal pool habitats in San Joaquin, Stanislaus, Merced, and western Madera counties supporting federally listed vernal pool invertebrates, California tiger salamander, and listed plant species.* Actions will be considered that protect existing natural vernal pool complexes supporting listed species in Zone 1 and Zone 2 Core Areas as described in the *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (especially sites that are known to be inhabited by narrowly endemic federally-listed species). Where possible, proposals should consider protecting lands that will complement existing protected lands and contribute to protection of contiguous blocks of habitat. In Merced County, proposals must be consistent with the priorities developed in the *Final Conservation Strategy for the UC Merced Project*. Proposals should 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). (5 points)

4. *Wetland, riparian, and other aquatic habitats and associated uplands supporting giant garter snake populations and movement corridors.* Actions will be considered that protect these important habitats. Proposals that focus on riparian corridors must demonstrate that the riparian area will support giant garter snake dispersal and how the corridor provides linkage for existing giant garter snake populations. Proposals should emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for species found in the *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake* (USFWS 1999). (3 points)

5. 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 Priority 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** (0 points)

V.A.2. Habitat Restoration Priority Actions

In order to qualify as a habitat restoration Priority Action, projects proposed for funding must: pertain to the restoration or enhancement of native plant and animal 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 focus the restoration primarily on CVP impacted species. Proposals that focus on restoration of habitats for a limited number of species of plants or animals (i.e., 1-3 species only) will not be considered under a restoration Priority Action unless specifically indicated below. Also, to be eligible for funding, the restoration action must occur on lands permanently protected by fee title, conservation easement, or other formal status for which the habitat(s) restored are specifically managed for the benefit of the CVP impacted species, and they must be protected in perpetuity. All proposals should clearly define and establish criteria for project completion and performance, as well as estimate when these completion criteria are expected to be met. Finally, in order to be eligible for funding, the parcel(s) to be restored must be specifically

identified in the proposal, and the landowners supporting the project identified.

1. *Restoration or creation of non-vernal pool wetlands, riparian habitat, and associated uplands supporting the giant garter snake within the historic range of this species in Merced and Fresno counties.* Actions should emphasize large-scale habitat connectivity, address how perennial water would be secured, how water quality would be improved, and how clean water would be provided to existing populations of giant garter snakes. Proposals that focus on riparian corridors must demonstrate that the riparian area will support giant garter snake dispersal and how the corridor provides linkage for existing giant garter snake populations. Proposals should emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks from the *Draft Recovery Plan for the Giant Garter Snake* (USFWS 1999). (9 points)

2. *Restoration of habitat for riverine dunes, Lange's metalmark butterfly, and two listed plants at the Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge.* Actions will be considered that provide for maintaining labor, supplying nursery services to raise and out-plant, the two listed plants (Antioch Dunes evening primrose and Contra Costa wallflower), and the non-listed Lange's metalmark butterfly host plant, (auriculate naked-stemmed buckwheat), removing invasive plants, and for purchasing and distributing suitable sand ground cover. Proposals should be set in the context of past restoration efforts. Proposals should emphasize priority one and two tasks for these species identified in the *Revised Recovery Plan for Three Endangered Species Endemic to Antioch Dunes, California* (USFWS 1980). (9 points)

3. *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 considered. The restoration effort should benefit core and satellite population areas (see *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California*) 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 ornate shrew, California jewelflower, palmate-bracted bird's beak, Kern mallow, San Joaquin woolly-threads, Hartweg's golden sunburst, 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 should emphasize priority one and two tasks for these species found in the *Recovery Plan for Upland Species of the San Joaquin Valley, California* (USFWS 1998b). (7 points)

4. *Habitat restoration in the East Bay hills for the benefit of the pallid manzanita*. The pallid manzanita it threatened by a variety of factors including disease, habitat loss and fragmentation as a result of urbanization, and habitat loss due to both native and non-native trees. Together these threats have resulted in the recent recommendation that the pallid manzanita be uplisted to endangered status. Restoration efforts are needed in order to prevent continued habitat loss due to encroachment and shading by trees. Proposals will be considered that work with appropriate land owners to restore pallid manzanita habitat in Contra Costa and Alameda counties, and use appropriate disturbance components to stimulate germination of the pallid manzanita seed bank. (5 points)

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 (0 points)

V.A.3. Research Priority Actions

At a minimum, proposals submitted under a research Priority Action must: include a clear and detailed study methodology; describe how deliverables would increase current and future

conservation and/or restoration of species or habitats impacted by the CVP; and describe how the research findings would benefit federally listed species. Research that effectively focuses on linking the results to improved or refined future management, restoration, and acquisition decisions for the CVPCP/HRP will be most favorably received. Multi-phase projects must detail how adequate data collection would be achieved if successive years are not funded. For projects having multiple phases which depend on future funding for success, the budget should be itemized for each year of research. If selected, multi-phase projects will be considered based on prior performance and funding availability. If permits would 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's 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 VI.C.4. of this FOA for more information). All research proposals will be independently evaluated 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 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. are to be conducted on private lands vs. public lands.

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. For research on animals, recipients must comply with laws and regulations as stated in Section IV.D. of this FOA.

1. *Research on methods to eradicate Phytophthera cinnamomi and control its spread in the east Bay Area (Contra Costa and Alameda counties)*. The non-native pathogen *Phytophthera cinnamomi* is considered one of the most damaging invasive species on a global scale. *Phytophthera cinnamomi* is a pathogen that causes root and crown rot in agricultural crops and native species, and is responsible for killing off large patches of pallid manzanita in the east Bay Area. These mass mortalities resulted in the recommendation that the species be uplisted from threatened to endangered in the most recent 5-year status reviews for this species. This pathogen survives in the soil in infected roots, or as long-lived resident spores; there is no known cure or prevention for this disease. As recommended in the 5-year status reviews, in order to reverse the declining population trends in pallid manzanita, research is needed to develop methods to control the spread of *Phytophthera cinnamomi* and eradicate it from areas already infested. Research on the control and spread of the pathogen relates directly to the on-the-ground habitat acquisition/restoration. By determining how to control the pathogen we can then apply meaningful restoration methods that will limit the impact of the disease on the plants. Similarly, if we understand more about the spread of the disease and how to control it, we can better identify areas for acquisition. (9 points)

2. *Research and development of a genetic management plan for vernal pool fairy shrimp*. The vernal pool fairy shrimp's range extends from southern Oregon southward to southern California; throughout this range the species has experienced habitat loss and fragmentation. Research and development of a genetic management plan is needed in order to achieve effective on the ground management for the benefit of the vernal pool fairy shrimp. The research product should specifically incorporate and analyze the latest population genetic data for this species in light of conservation objectives including identifying sites needed for restoration and protection. Historic connectivity and migration and current levels of genetic distinctness should be addressed. The plan should also provide recommendations for 1) future areas needed for restoration and reserve design/acquisition while incorporating metapopulation dynamics, 2) sites and sources for captive propagation and

reintroductions, and 3) target population sizes needed to maintain genetic diversity. (7 points)

3. *Research and development of a genetic management plan for Callippe silverspot butterfly*. The Callippe silverspot butterfly has experienced both range contraction and loss of populations. Research and development of a genetic management plan is needed in order to achieve effective on the ground management for the benefit of the Callippe silverspot butterfly. The research product should specifically incorporate and analyze the latest population genetic data for this species in light of conservation objectives including identifying sites needed for restoration and protection. Historic connectivity and migration and current levels of genetic distinctness should be addressed. The plan should also provide recommendations for 1) future areas needed for restoration and reserve design/acquisition while incorporating metapopulation dynamics, 2) sites and sources for captive propagation and reintroductions, and 3) target population sizes needed to maintain genetic diversity. (7 points)

4. Other research that addresses 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 that are rated as Very High priority on the Priority Species list, a link to which can be found on the CVPCP/HRP website. Other research proposals are limited in scope for FY 2012, and must consider at least one of the following: (a) projects that would help determine *which* habitats should be acquired and/or restored to most benefit CVPCP/HRP high priority species/habitats; (b) projects that would help identify specific properties to be acquired and/or restored to most benefit CVPCP/HRP high priority species/habitats (i.e. species surveys); (c) projects that would help determine *how* habitats should be restored to most benefit CVPCP/HRP high priority species/habitats; and/or (d) projects that would help gauge the biological responses to restoration projects that most benefit CVPCP/HRP high priority species/habitats**. 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 (**0 points).

V.A.4. Captive Propagation and Reintroduction

The focus of this category is on projects for which a critical component to the recovery of a federally listed CVP impacted species is the capture, propagation, and reintroduction of the species into its native habitat. If any species are held live in captivity during the course of the research/study, the applicant must describe in the proposal what would happen to the animals after the study is completed, i.e., be returned to the wild, be kept in captivity, etc. For captive breeding of animals, recipients must comply with laws and regulations as stated in Section IV.D. of this FOA.

Additionally, if the proposal includes implementation of reintroductions in addition to a reintroduction plan, then specific reintroduction site(s) must be identified in the proposal, and written approval from the landowner of the proposed reintroduction site(s) must be included with the proposal. Also, only lands protected in perpetuity, and specifically managed for the benefit of the species, will be considered for reintroduction of species.

1. *Captive propagation and reintroduction of large-flowered fiddleneck in Contra Costa and San Joaquin counties*. Actions will be considered that continue efforts to propagate and reintroduce large-flowered fiddleneck to Contra Costa and San Joaquin counties. The rationale for selection of reintroduction sites should be clearly stated and implementation of species-specific management plans at these sites should be included in proposals. Proposals should clearly define and establish criteria for project completion, and establish a timeline for completion of criteria. Proposals should

emphasize implementation of appropriate priority one and two tasks for species found in the *Large-flowered Fiddleneck (Amsinckia grandiflora) Recovery Plan* (USFWS 1997). (9 points)

2. *Lange's metalmark captive breeding program for reintroduction at the Antioch Dunes National*

Wildlife Refuge. Actions would be considered that continue/expand upon the current captive breeding program to raise Lange's metalmark butterflies and release them at the Antioch Dunes National Wildlife Refuge. Proposals should clearly define and establish criteria for project completion, and establish a timeline for completion of criteria. Proposals should 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 1984). (7 points)

3. *Captive propagation and reintroduction of riparian brush rabbit.* The ongoing riparian brush rabbit recovery project on the San Joaquin River National Wildlife Refuge (Refuge) and other lands is the primary recovery effort for this species. Extensive land acquisition, riparian woodland restoration, flood refugia construction, and endangered species recovery work have been completed over the past decade. As a result of severe flooding at the Refuge during Spring 2011 that may have significantly impacted riparian brush rabbit populations there, additional funding may be needed for the continuation of the successful captive propagation and reintroduction work including captive propagation, health screening, reintroduction, monitoring of collared and tagged rabbits, habitat assessments, and reporting. Proposals should 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). (5 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 Valle*y, *California* (USFWS 1998b), *Recovery Plan for Gabbro Soil Plants of the Central Sierra Nevada Foothills* (USFWS 2002), and *Recovery Plan for Vernal Pool Ecosystems of California and Southern Oregon* (USFWS 2005). (0 points)

V.B. EVALUATION CRITERIA

Applications will be evaluated by a technical panel in accordance with the criteria in section V.D, and the corresponding weight assigned to each criterion. The criteria and points will be used by the CVPCP Technical Team to score the applications received. This information is provided to assist the applicant in preparing a detailed proposed 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.C. PROGRAM RANKING CRITERIA

Proposals will be evaluated, scored, and ranked by the CVPCP & HRP Technical Team in accordance with the 13 Program Ranking Criteria listed below. These ranking criteria are fully described in Section V.D.

(1) Program Priority Action: Point numbers are in accordance with Priority Actions within each activity category. The FY 2012 Priority Actions are fully described in Section V.A.

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

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

(3) 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

(4) <u>Federal or State Species that are not Listed and not Proposed for Listing</u>:

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

(5) Habitats/Biodiversity:
(for Acq/Rest proposals)
0 = none
1-2 = low
3-4 = medium
5-6 = high

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

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

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

(9) 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

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

(11) Project Urgency:
0 = none
3 = low
6 = medium

9 = high

(12) Technical Merit and Completeness of Proposal:

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

(13) Scientific Merit:
(for Research proposals)

0 = none
3 = low
6 = medium
9 = high

V.D. EXPLANATION OF PROPOSAL EVALUATION AND RANKING PROCESS

Proposals received by the CVPCP and HRP are evaluated for their eligibility to apply for program funds according to the guidelines put forth in this FOA. Eligible proposals are placed into the four activity categories described in Section I.E.: Land Acquisition, Habitat Restoration, Research, and Captive Propagation and Reintroduction.

ELIGIBILITY TO RANK

The Reclamation Grants Officer and/or the CVPCP/HRP Program Managers determine whether or not the proposal merits evaluation and ranking under the guidelines put forth in this FOA. Eligibility is determined 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 Grants Officer or Program Managers will consider whether or not the proposal meets the goals and objectives of the CVPCP and HRP, etc. For past performance, the Grants Officer or Program Managers will consider how well the project applicant, as a previous grant recipient, complied with submitting invoices, reports, and other requested information (*e.g.*, Appraisal Report, Recorded Grant Deed, Title Report, Closing Statement) for previous projects in a complete and timely manner; communicated and coordinated on past projects between themselves and the granting agency; 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.

CVP NEXUS

This proposal eligibility factor 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 Priority Project Area Map (http://www.usbr.gov/mp/cvpcp/).

2) Is there a strong linkage between an affected habitat and/or species and the CVP?

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.1 *CRITERION #1 - PROGRAM PRIORITY ACTION*

FOR ACQUISITION, HABITAT RESTORATION, RESEARCH , AND CAPTIVE PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION 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 addressing higher priority areas, and higher priority species receiving more points than those addressing lower priority areas and species. Priority Actions, and the corresponding pre-assigned number of points, are indicated in Section V.C of this FOA.

V.D.2 *CRITERION #2 - FEDERALLY LISTED SPECIES BENEFITS*

This criterion is used to distinguish between proposed projects that have specific benefits to species (excluding fish) 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.** Proposals for which CVP impacted species have been surveyed and documented on the project site will receive a higher score under this criterion than for projects where the presence of those species has not been documented. 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

This criterion asks the following question: Does the proposal provide a major, moderate, or minimal benefit to federally listed and proposed species that have been impacted by the CVP? Parcels proposed for acquisition or restoration having documented occurrences of federally listed and proposed 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 from the proposed acquisition, and explain how each species would directly or indirectly benefit.

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 documented to be utilized by the CVPCP's/HRP's priority 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 the CVPCP's/HRP's priority 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 not utilized by the CVPCP's/HRP's priority 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 HABITAT RESTORATION PROPOSALS

For restoration proposals, 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 would 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 would 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 from the proposed restoration, and explain how each species would directly or indirectly benefit.

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

For study and survey proposals, proposed actions should incorporate a link to on-going or potential future acquisition and/or restoration actions. A **major** benefit could result if the Technical Team determines that the proposed work would (1) help determine *which* habitats should be acquired and/or restored, (2) help identify specific properties to be acquired and/or restored, (3) help

determine *how* habitats should be restored, or (4) help gauge biological responses to restoration projects. 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 but the data is not linked to any known existing on-the-ground, proposed, or future potential acquisition or restoration activities. 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 PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION

For captive propagation proposals, proposed projects are ranked based on the scope and effectiveness of the project. A **major** benefit would be an effort that addresses the CVPCP's/HRP's priority species and has the potential to significantly improve conditions for species over the long term. An extensive project that addresses the programs' priority 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 habitat but which provides limited benefits to listed species. 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.3 *CRITERION #3 - STATE LISTED SPECIES BENEFITS*

FOR ACQUISITION, HABITAT RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION PROPOSALS

This criterion is used to distinguish between proposed 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 in this category 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.4 *CRITERION #4 – FEDERAL OR STATE SPECIES THAT ARE NOT LISTED AND NOT PROPOSED FOR LISTING:*

FOR ACQUISITION, HABITAT RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION PROPOSALS

This criterion is used to distinguish between proposed 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.5 *CRITERION #5 - HABITAT/BIODIVERSITY*

FOR ACQUISITION ANDHABITAT RESTORATION PROPOSALS ONLY (EXCLUDES RESEARCH AND CAPTIVE PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION)

This criterion is used to distinguish between proposed projects that have benefits to ecosystems that

currently support 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 Research and Captive Propagation and Reintroduction proposals, since these projects tend to focus on specific habitats related to a particular species.

V.D.6 ***CRITERION #6 - CUMULATIVE BENEFIT***

For the cumulative benefit criterion to be effectively scored, the proposal must indicate how the proposed project would contribute to past or on-going activities related to the same species or habitats, including past CVPCP/HRP-funded projects.

FOR ACQUISITION PROPOSALS

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 HABITAT RESTORATION PROPOSALS

An example of proposed projects with **major** cumulative benefits would be a habitat 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 PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION PROPOSALS

For proposed captive breeding projects, 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.7 *CRITERION* #7 - LONG-TERM BENEFIT

FOR ACQUISITION AND HABITAT RESTORATION PROPOSALS

This criterion is used to distinguish between proposed 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. This criterion addresses the effect of the proposed project going forward.

An example of a **major** benefit would be a project in which the property and/or restored habitat would be preserved intact and in perpetuity, and where the protected properties have "potential" for supporting additional species. An example of a **moderate** ranking might be a project in which long-term benefits are uncertain because a property proposed to be acquired does not currently support species on site, and the potential for attracting and supporting additional species is questionable, i.e., no confirmed species present and no assurances that they would be there in the future. An example of a **minimal** ranking might be a project in which a property and/or restored habitat may be near, or directly adjacent to, potential negative disturbances such as a proposed future housing development or probable future vineyard planting.

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

Examples of a **major** long-term benefit from a survey/study might be a vernal pool habitat mapping study which would identify areas of vernal pools and quantify acres of habitat to facilitate a better understanding of where vernal pools currently exist, so that the information could be considered for possible future land acquisition, or a study that identifies components of a successful habitat restoration for CVP impacted species. 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), or does not link to future benefits of species at an on-going or future potential or proposed acquisition or restoration site.

FOR CAPTIVE BREEDING AND REINTRODUCTION PROPOSALS

For proposed captive breeding projects, this criterion is used distinguish between projects that would contribute to a lasting positive effect on species and habitats, as opposed to projects that would result in only a short term gain and that would not "carry over" into future years. A **major** long term benefit could be the establishment or maintenance of a captive breeding effort that is critically needed and which would add significantly to the recovery of a listed species. A **moderate** benefit could be captive breeding that helps maintain a population but which is not tied to a reintroduction or reestablishment plan. A **minor** benefit would be a project where captive breeding is proposed or continued but for which its contribution to the future well-being of the species in unclear.

V.D.8 *CRITERION #8* - PROJECT SITE CONNECTIVITY

FOR ACQUISITION AND HABITAT RESTORATION PROPOSALS ONLY (EXCLUDES RESEARCH AND CAPTIVE PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION PROPOSALS)

This criterion is used to distinguish between proposed 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 the project's geographic location, and does not consider other collective influences on the project's overall impact and effectiveness. This spatial criterion does not apply to research or captive propagation and reintroduction proposals.

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.9 *CRITERION #9* - PARTNERS

FOR ACQUISITION, HABITAT RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION PROPOSALS

The information for this criterion should be displayed in the SF-424 and described in the required budget narrative as well as shown in a budget table in an appendix of each proposal that is submitted. For the budget table format, applicants should refer to and use the template shown in Appendix C. The Partners criterion gives credit to financial contributions of cash and/or an equivalent in-kind service 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, which offsets costs that would otherwise be borne by the CVPCP/HRP. Information on the amount and nature of each partner contribution must be provided in order for partnering levels to be ascertained and credited. Project applicants must incorporate the following in the budget table and budget narrative of their proposals: (1) the name of each partner contributing cash or in-kind contributions toward the total cost of the project (other than the CVPCP/HRP), (2) the amount to be contributed by each of those partners in dollars, as well as percentage of the total project cost, and (3) a partner contribution must have a direct link and bring added value to the current project being proposed. Proposals must equate in-kind services to dollars or those services will not be considered when partnering points are tallied. Partner cost sharing will only be considered for scoring under this criterion when the partner funding is applied directly to a component of the proposed project, and where the cost shared funds were not expended prior to receiving the CVPCP/HRP grant award, including past CVPCP/HRP contributions. 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." In the case of other grants being pursued, an applicant should provide explicit information about where the applicant is in the funding process. Project funding (e.g., other grants) already in hand should be described, including the name of the grant or funding source, any collaborators, and amount, as applicable. 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 under this criterion.

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

V.D.10 *CRITERION #10* - LEVEL OF CVP IMPACTS

FOR ACQUISITION, HABITAT RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION 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.

V.D.11 *CRITERION #11* - PROJECT URGENCY

FOR ACQUISITION, HABITAT RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION 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 any of the categories) addresses the needs of a species threatened with extinction (critically endangered) unless effective recovery actions described in the proposal are not carried out. A **moderate** ranking could occur when the need to recover the species is great, but the land is already protected in perpetuity. A **low** ranking could occur when no listed species have been detected on the property.

V.D.12 *CRITERION #12* - TECHNICAL MERIT AND COMPLETENESS OF PROPOSAL

FOR ACQUISITION, HABITAT RESTORATION, RESEARCH, AND CAPTIVE PROPAGATION AND REINTRODUCTION PROPOSALS

Proposals should be well-described and will be ranked for completeness and technical accuracy. The Technical Team's considerations will include, but not be limited to, the following: 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 Priority Action(s) and ranking criteria; how well the proposal package adhered to the required format; the quality and completeness of the description of the project monitoring and management plan (as applicable), etc. 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.13 *CRITERION #13* – SCIENTIFIC MERIT

FOR RESEARCH PROPOSALS

This criterion considers the scientific rigor of the proposed project. The proposal will be evaluated on several criteria including, but not limited to, the following: its scientific soundness, appropriateness of methods, cohesiveness of argument, organization and clarity of methods (statistical design and analysis), length relative to information content, etc. 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 it is scientifically sound. A **low** rank will be assigned to proposals with significant methodological flaws, flawed reasoning, and/or extensive lack of clarity.

V.D.14 TOTAL POINTS

When points are assigned to all evaluation and ranking criteria, and the evaluation of the proposal is complete, points received for the evaluation and ranking criteria for a particular proposal in a particular activity category are summed, a final project score is obtained for the proposal, and the proposal is "ranked" in order from highest to lowest total score. The evaluation and ranking criteria differ somewhat for the acquisition, restoration, research activity, and captive propagation and reintroduction categories, therefore, proposals are evaluated and ranked separately within each of the 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 or Cooperative Agreement document by mail, signed by a Grants Officer, notifying the applicant of the project award amount by May 2012. 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 2013 (October 1, 2012).**

VI.B AWARD DOCUMENT

If your organization is awarded an agreement through this FOA, applicable portions of the proposal may 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

To ensure the accuracy and data integrity of your project, it is requested that you provide spatial information (boundaries, study areas, parcels, point locations, etc.) in the form of an ESRI shape file with projection. The preferred projection is UTM, Zone (appropriate zone), NAD83; the Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office (SFWO) standard. FGDC compliant metadata must accompany each file. For additional information regarding metadata standards refer to http://www.fgdc.gov. Please include any USFWS File Numbers associated with the data in your documentation.

The shape files may be copied to a DVD and mailed to:

Sacramento Fish and Wildlife Office
2800 Cottage Way, Room W-2605
Sacramento, CA, 95825
Attn: GIS Branch Chief
or emailed to Cheryl_Hickam@fws.gov

If you cannot provide a shape file with metadata, please feel free to contact the SFWO GIS Branch Chief, Cheryl Hickam, (916) 414-6708.

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 PARTNER FUNDING[1,2]	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						

[1]The name of each partner (excluding the CVPCP/HRP) contributing cash or in-kind contributions toward the total cost of the project must be shown.
[2]The amount of cash or in-kind contributions from each partner (excluding the CVPCP/HRP) must be shown in dollars as well as the percentage of the total project cost.

Sources of Funding

Recipient
Cash:_____
In-Kind Services:_____
Partner(s) _____
Cash:_____
In-Kind Services:_____
CVPCP/HRP:_____
Total Activity Funding:_____

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. 1997. Large-flowered Fiddleneck (*Amsinckia grandiflora*) Recovery Plan. Portland, Oregon. 45 pp.

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

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

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

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. 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.