Proposal Solicitation Package
April 10, 1998 Draft Exerpts

Table of Contents: Pages 1 - 3

The table of contents is included to allow Roundtable members to understand how the package is being organized. Many of the sections are not included in this package because they are updated versions of what was in the 1997 RFP.

Criteria for Proposal Evaluation: Pages 4 - 6

For many of the topics in the Proposal Solicitation Package, the review criteria will be based on the criteria developed last year. Some of the subquestions within criteria are not applicable to a particular topic and so will be dropped for that topic.

Topics in Proposal Solicitation Package: Pages 7 - 23

These are the descptions of the background, type of proposals being solicited and any other information needed on coordination or geographic scope. These descriptions are based on the recommendations of the Integration Panel. Fish passage, watershed management, floodplain, and education were modified based on comments from the Roundtable or the Policy Team. The revised versions were reviewed by the Integration Panel.

Staff working on the Fish Passage implemetation topic have also identified some refined criteria for that topic which is included on page10 to 13.

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary

II General Information

A. Objectives of the Category III Proposal Solicitation Package

B. Background on the CALFED Bay-Delta Program

C. Background on Category III and Projects Funded to Date

D. How to Use This Proposal Solicitation Package

E. April 1998 Proposal Solicitation Topics

F. Who May Apply

G. Geographic Scope

H. Conflict of Interest and Confidentiality

I. Minimum Requirements

J. 1998 Category III Funding Priorities

1. Implementation Strategy
2. Identification of Stressors

K. Proposal Completion Checklist

III. Budget Category/Topics

A. Fish Passage Assessment

1. Description

2. Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation

3. Evaluation/Selection Process and Schedule for Formal Proposals

4. Formal Proposal Format and Content

5. Contract Requirements

B. Fish Passage Improvements

1. Description

2. Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation

3. Evaluation/Selection Process and Schedule for Formal Proposals

4. Formal Proposal Format and Content

5. Contract Requirements

C. Floodplain and Habitat Restoration

1. Description

2. Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation

3. Evaluation/Selection Process and Schedule for Formal Proposals

4. Formal Proposal Format and Content

5. Contract Requirements

D. Gravel Restoration

1. Description

2. Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation

3. Evaluation/Selection Process and Schedule for Formal Proposals

4. Formal Proposal Format and Content

5. Contract Requirements

E. Fish Harvest

1. Description

2. Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation

3. Evaluation/Selection Process and Schedule for Formal Proposals

4. Formal Proposal Format and Content

5. Contract Requirements

F. Species Life History Studies

1. Description

2. Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation

3. Evaluation/Selection Process and Schedule for Formal Proposals

4. Formal Proposal Format and Content

5. Contract Requirements

G. Watershed Planning

1. Description

2. Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation

3. Evaluation/Selection Process and Schedule for Formal Proposals

4. Formal Proposal Format and Content

5. Contract Requirements

H. Education

1. Description

2. Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation

3. Evaluation/Selection Process and Schedule for Formal Proposals

4. Formal Proposal Format and Content

5. Contract Requirements

I. Small Screen Evaluations - Alternatives and Biological Priorities

1. Description

2. Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation

3. Evaluation/Selection Process and Schedule for Formal Proposals

4. Formal Proposal Format and Content

5. Contract Requirements

Attachment A - Geographic Scope of PSP Projects and Programs

Attachment B - Implementation Strategy Excerpts

Attachment C - Information on Stressors Affecting Priority Species and Habitats

Attachment D - Terms and Conditions for State (CALFED) Funds

Attachment E - Terms and Conditions for Federal (Dept of Interior) Funds

Attachment F - Terms and Conditions for Federal (EPA) Funds

Attachment G - Cover Sheet

E-029753

Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation *(SAMPLE)*

Formal proposals which meet the minimum requirements shall be evaluated using the following criteria. To be eligible for funding all proposals must benefit one or more of the priority species or habitats listed in Section D. Proposals that are scored zero for biological benefit, applicant's ability or technical feasibility will be eliminated from further evaluation. Cost sharing and local involvement is not an absolute requirement, but is encouraged.

1. Ecological and biological benefits
2. Applicant's ability
3. Technical feasibility and timing
4. Cost sharing and local involvement
5. Compatibility and benefits to non-ecosystem CALFED objectives
6. Cost
7. Monitoring, assessment, and reporting

For each of the specified criteria, the considerations are as follows:

1. Ecological/ Biological Benefits

- What is the ecological and biological effectiveness of the proposal in addressing a stressor and benefiting priority species or habitats?
- Are there multiple benefits to species, habitats or natural processes? Are multiple stressors addressed?
- To what extent does the proposal use natural processes and functions as a means of restoration?
- Is the proposal expected to provide long-term ecological/biological benefits? For example are there permanent land protections associated with land transactions and habitat restoration proposals?

2. Applicant's Ability: applicant's capabilities, experience, and record of past performance as well as experience and qualifications of key personnel.

- Does the applicant's experience, education, or background indicate that he/she is capable of implementing the proposal?
- If applicant has received grants or contracts previously, what is the applicant's past record of performance in meeting the objectives and conditions of those grants and contracts?

3. Technical Feasibility and Timing

- Is the proposal sound in its technical approach, including but not limited to hydrological

modeling where appropriate?

- Have all reasonable options been evaluated?
- Does the proposal demonstrate an understanding of the problems?
- Is the proposal ready to be funded or are there actions that the applicant is planning to complete prior funding? For example, if funding is requested for construction, have all required permits and design work been completed or is it expected to be completed in time to avoid delays in the project?

4. ***Cost sharing and Local Involvement***

- Is the applicant sharing in the cost of the project?
- Are other entities sharing in the cost of the project?
- Does the proposal "leverage" other funding sources to support this or other restoration actions?
- When in-kind services are proposed for cost sharing, does the proposal include a method of documenting in-kind services?
- Is the proposal coordinated with other restoration programs and projects in the area?
- Is there local support or involvement for the proposal?
- Is the proposal supported by a local watershed management plan?
- Is there a plan for public notification/outreach which informs local landowners in the area of the proposed project? If the proposal is for a site specific acquisition or restoration project, have the adjacent landowners been notified of the proposal, and if not what is the plan for notifying adjacent landowners?
- Does the project have potential for significant local benefits or impacts including activities related to flood control, water diversions, local economy, and/or local landowners?

5. ***Compatibility and benefits to non-ecosystem CALFED objectives: water quality, water supply reliability, and system integrity.***

- Does the proposal have multiple benefits related to the other CALFED objectives?
- Are there conflicts with other CALFED objectives?

- Does the project have the potential for significant adverse or beneficial impacts to third parties?

6. Cost

- How does the cost of the proposal (including direct and indirect costs) compare to other similar proposals?
- Is the level of funding requested for the proposed activity reasonable? How does applicant plan to use its' resources to maximize cost effectiveness, such as labor, equipment, class of staff used for different items, supplies?
- Does the proposal include overhead costs? If so are they reasonable?
- How will operations and maintenance costs, if any, be funded?

*7. **Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting***

- Does the proposal provide adequate details and resources for both biological and financial monitoring and reporting?
- Is the biological/ecological monitoring component of the proposal coordinated with existing and/or anticipated monitoring programs?
- Does the proposal have performance measures and indicators to determine biological/ecological success?
- Does the proposal include a discussion to compare the proposed methodology with alternatives to support its approach?

III.A.1 Fish Passage Assessment

Background: In many areas, high quality aquatic habitat exists upstream of small agricultural power diversions on tributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. These diversion structures and dams block fish passage, can adversely impact downstream migration, and can alter flow patterns. They can restrict natural sediment transport processes which can result in channel incision and other adverse geomorphological changes. Although some diversions include fish passage facilities, these are not always effective and do not address sediment transport issues.

Removal of these diversion dams can provide unimpeded fish passage to upstream anadromous fish habitat and can improve downstream migration conditions for juveniles. Natural sediment transport can also resume. In addition to removal of dams, there may be other alternatives such as consolidation of existing structures that can reduce the number of fish passage facilities needed and may provide more ecological benefits than retaining all strucutres with traditional fish ladder and screening solutions.

In addition to fish passage problems at diversion dams, there are some areas where changes to the stream channel have caused fish passage concerns. Opportunities exist to reduce fish migration delays, stranding and straying resulting from these fish passage problems through mechanical manipulation coupled with instream flow management.

Eligible Proposals: Proposals are being solicited to assesss fish passage problems and identify solutions. This can be accomplished through cooperative efforts to develop workgroups of experts to work with local efforts to conduct the assessments necessary to identify small diversion dams which are appropriate for removal or consolidation, and small diversion dams which need to be replaced or modified with fish-friendly structures. Proposals can address entire Bay-Delta watershed or can concentrate on smaller areas within the geographic area of consideration (see Geographic Area). In evaluating a structure, there should be some assessment of cost-effectiveness, ecological considerations such as the type of upstream habitat, and other factors such as water conservation and non-structural flood management. These experts would need to be able to properly balance quantitative cost-benefit analysis with non-quantifiable costs and benefits.

Note: Proposals which include actual construction of fish passage facilities or structures should be submitted under Category/Topic III.B - Fish Passage Improvements.

Geographic Area: Throughout the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta system.

Recommended Funding: It is expected that up to $500,000 will be available <u>but not all of these funds will necessarily be obligated in this funding cycle.</u>

Coordination: Proposals should include coordination with representatives from agencies such as ACOE, Bureau of Reclamation, and NMFS, environmental groups, local watershed groups, irrigation districts, power companies, dam operators, and dam owners.

III.B.1 Fish Passage Improvements

Background: In recent years, fisheries resources have declined to record low levels in California's Central Valley streams. Fishery declines are associated with a wide variety of factors, including habitat destruction, alteration of in-stream flows, construction of dams, and entrainment into water diversions. In many cases, high quality aquatic habitat exists upstream of agricultural and power diversions on tributaries of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers. These diversion structures and dams block fish passage, can adversely impact downstream migration, and can alter flow patterns. They can also restrict natural sediment transport processes which can result in channel incision and other adverse geomorphological changes.

Direct mortality to fisheries resources occurs as a result of unscreened diversions, diversions not screened to current standards, inoperable screens, and impingement. The significance of this stressor on a fish population varies depending on the size, location, type, duration and timing of the diversion. Restoration actions targeted at reducing entrainment may include new fish screens, screen rehabilitation, screen improvements, or alternatives to screening such as consolidation or relocation of diversions.

Removal of diversion dams and screening of intakes can provide unimpeded fish passage for adults moving up and juveniles moving down. It can provide access to high quality upstream habitat and improve survival during outmigration. In some cases, complete barrier removal may not be possible, but there may be options such as consolidation of existing structures which reduce the number of fish passage facilities and may provide more ecological benefits than the traditional fish ladder and screening solutions at each dam. If removal or consolidation of problematic structures is not possible, fish passage and screening structures may need to be constructed or retrofitted to allow for effective fish migration.

Eligible Proposals: Proposals will be solicited to fund projects that identify and implement solutions that address fish passage and entrainment stressors. These projects can include consolidation of diversions, removal of dams, removal of instream obstructions, implementation of "fish friendly" dam operations, construction or rehabilitation of fish screens, and construction of ladders if no other passage solution can be implemented.

Geographic Area: Throughout the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta system in areas where high quality habitat will be made accessible to high priority species.

Recommended Funding: Up to $8,000,000

Coordination: Efforts should be coordinated with any group set up under the "Fish Passage Assessment" Focused Grant, with entities which own or operate diversions, with local conservancies or watershed groups, and with the state and federal agencies involved in fish passage issues including CDFG, CDWR, USBR, USFWS, NMFS, and FERC.

Criteria for evaluation: Priority will be given to fish passage projects that (a) include a thorough evaluation of all alternatives to improve fish passage, (b) provide an important

ecological benefit, (c) address multiple high priority stressors within a particular watershed, (d) make previously inaccessible, high quality habitat accessible to fishes native to that habitat (projects aimed at introducing non-native populations into habitats in which they are unlikely to have existed historically will not be considered), (e) remove (rather than modify) man-made barriers (f) are practical, (g) evaluate costs and benefits of barrier removal comprehensively (including costs and benefits that may not be quantifiable, or not easily quantifiable), and (h) are well coordinated with watershed restoration plans and local watershed groups.

Priorities for fish screening projects include (a) a focus on priority fish species, (b) locations along the stream channel that are expected to remain stable over time, (c) are cost effective considering the cost of the screen and the resources being protected, and (d) are associated with fish passage projects so that upstream and downstream passage issues can be addressed concurrently.

III B 2

Criteria for Formal Proposal Evaluation for Fish Passage Projects

Formal proposals which meet the minimum requirements shall be evaluated using the following criteria. To be eligible for funding all proposals must benefit one or more of the priority species or habitats listed in Section D. Proposals that are scored zero for biological benefit, applicant's ability or technical feasibility will be eliminated from further evaluation. Cost sharing and local involvement is not an absolute requirement, but is encouraged.

1. Ecological and biological benefits
2. Applicant's ability
3. Technical feasibility and timing
4. Cost sharing and local involvement
5. Compatibility and benefits to non-ecosystem CALFED objectives
6. Cost
7. Monitoring, assessment, and reporting

For each of the specified criteria, the considerations are as follows:

1. Ecological/ Biological Benefits:

- What is the ecological and biological effectiveness of the proposal in addressing a stressor and benefitting priority species or habitats?
- Will the project promote and restore a natural process of geomorphic characteristics, nutrient dynamics, and production capabilities?
- How much habitat would be made available to priority species as a result of this proposal?
- Rarity of the habitat or have stream miles been listed as critical habitat under ESA?
- How will implementing the proposed project effect existing stream flows and aquatic productivity?
- How costly will fish passage improvements be relative to the resource benefit received? (E.g. Dollars / fish spawner)
- Will improvements potentially preclude the listing of candidate or other species listed under CALFED or the Endangered Species Act and support measures mandated by subsection 3406(b) of the CVPIA restoration efforts?
- Provide an estimate of specific fish species and estimated improvements in passage in each species. Numeric estimates should be provided if available citing existing studies.

10

- Are there multiple benefits to species, habitats or natural processes? Are multiple stressors addressed?

- To what extent does the proposal use natural processes and functions as a means of restoration?

- Is the proposal expected to provide long-term ecological/biological benefits? For example are there permanent land protections associated with land transactions and habitat restoration proposals?

2. ***Applicant's Ability: applicant's capabilities, experience, and record of past performance as well as experience and qualifications of key personnel.***

- Does the applicant's experience, education, or background indicate that he/she is capable of implementing the proposal?

- If applicant has received grants or contracts previously, what is the applicant's past record of performance in meeting the objectives and conditions of those grants and contracts?

3. ***Technical Feasibility and Timing***

- Is the proposal sound in its technical approach, including but not limited to hydrological modeling where appropriate?

- With respect to construction of the project, are there windows of opportunity or other constraints that should be considered in the prioritization process?

- Have all reasonable alternatives been evaluated and ramifications of implementing the alternatives?

- Does the proposal demonstrate an understanding of the problems?

- How drought resistant is the proposed project area?

- Is the proposal ready to be funded or are there actions that the applicant is planning to complete prior funding? For example, if funding is requested for construction, have all required permits and design work been completed or is it expected to be completed in time to avoid delays in the project?

4. ***Cost sharing and Local Involvement***

- Is the applicant sharing in the cost of the project?

- Are other entities sharing in the cost of the project?

//

- Does the proposal "leverage" or complete prior fish passage improvements or provide a large element of on-going restoration work or work that is planned and / or funded?

- When in-kind services are proposed for cost sharing, does the proposal include a method of documenting in-kind services?

- Is the proposal coordinated with other restoration programs and projects in the area?

- Is there local support or involvement for the proposal?

- Is the proposal supported by a local watershed management plan?

- Is there a plan for public notification/outreach which informs local landowners in the area of the proposed project? If the proposal is for a site specific acquisition or restoration project, have the adjacent landowners been notified of the proposal, and if not what is the plan for notifying adjacent landowners?

- Does the project have potential for significant local benefits or impacts including activities related to flood control, water diversions, local economy, and/or local landowners?

5. ***Compatibility and benefits to non-ecosystem CALFED objectives: water quality, water supply reliability, and system integrity.***

- Does the proposal have multiple benefits related to the other CALFED objectives?

- Are there conflicts with other CALFED objectives?

- Will sedimentation, turbidity, or water quality become a problem?

- Does the project have the potential for significant adverse or beneficial impacts to third parties?

6. ***Cost***

- How does the cost of the proposal (including direct and indirect costs) compare to other similar proposals?

- Is the level of funding requested for the proposed activity reasonable? How does applicant plan to use its' resources to maximize cost effectiveness, such as labor, equipment, class of staff used for different items, supplies?

- Does the proposal include overhead costs? If so are they reasonable?

- How will operations and maintenance costs, if any, be funded?

7. Monitoring, Assessment and Reporting

- Does the proposal provide adequate details and resources for both biological and financial monitoring and reporting?
- Is the biological/ecological monitoring component of the proposal coordinated with existing and/or anticipated monitoring programs?
- Does the proposal have performance measures and indicators to determine biological/ecological success?
- Does the proposal include a discussion to compare the proposed methodology with alternatives to support its approach?

III.C.1 Floodplain Acquisition and Restoration

Background: Encroachment by agricultural and urban development has restricted floodplains, which can lead to reduced riparian habitat and loss of shaded riverine aquatic habitat. In some cases, the landowners in the floodplain also face repeated flooding of their land with the resulting loss of agricultural revenue and loss of property. Opportunities now exist on many rivers which were heavily flooded in January 1997 to expand floodways and riparian corridors, thus providing greater flood management flexibility and concurrently benefitting the ecosystem. Many of these timely opportunities have been identified by the USDA/NRCS during their response to the January 1997 floods.

Floodplain restoration actions often focus on use of natural processes and are not well understood by the public. Since projects such as setback levees, restoration of river channel meanders, and other such efforts require local cooperation and understanding for implementation to be successful, habitat restoration demonstration projects can function as an educational tool for the restoration and/or creation of different habitat types. At the same time, they are an important experimental tool to increase technical understanding of floodplain habitat management and restoration.

Creation of habitat links directly to CALFED's Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan, which contains goals of restoring thousands of acres of wetland and riparian habitat. Restoration demonstration projects would be especially appropriate on streams and rivers where priority species are known to benefit from a particular type of habitat.

Eligible Proposals: Proposals will be solicited to identify and acquire (through fee title or permanent easement) lands within the floodplains of the major rivers or their tributaries. A particular emphasis will be placed on the lands flooded in January 1997. Areas that can be acquired by permanent conservation easements are preferred over fee title acquisitions, if they meet the relevant ecological objective for floodplain restoration. Funds may also be provided for habitat restoration of existing conservation lands within the floodplain.

Fund habitat restoration and/or creation demonstration projects that benefit priority species in different parts of the watershed. This may also include funding an interpretive element of habitat restoration projects which have been approved through the 1997 CALFED Category III process. The demonstration projects must show habitat needs, values, and opportunities for restoration, and must be located in areas which are accessible to the public. These efforts should include local landowner cooperation to allow controlled public access to the interpretive site.

Geographic Area: Throughout the entire Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta system, including tributaries.

Recommended Funding: $14,000,000. At least $2,000,000 will be allocated to habitat restoration demonstration projects.

Coordination: Work with local landowners through USDA/NRCS state and regional staff to

identify and provide matching funds for Wetlands Reserve Program projects submitted for review after the January 1997 flooding, which were not funded based on limited funding. The US Army Corps and State Reclamation Board should be involved, particularly given their interest in the San Joaquin Valley and flood management.

Demonstration projects will require coordination between the project proponent and local landowners (especially on adjacent parcels), conservancies, and resource agencies. The project proponent also needs to advertise the educational and interpretive opportunities which will be made available.

III.D.1 Gravel Restoration

Background: Dams have interrupted the natural alluvial sediment transport processes which can negatively impact river channel morphology and the aquatic habitat available to native species. In some cases, rivers have responded to this lack of sustainable coarse-sediment supply with channel incision and bed-surface coarsening. In other cases, lack of channel forming flows have allowed increased amounts of fine materials to be deposited. This reduces both the quantity and quality of spawning habitat available to native anadromous fish species and reduces food chain (e.g., benthic macroinvertebrate) production.

In addition, sediment transport continuity has been interrupted in some areas due to the impacts of instream and floodplain aggregate and gold mining. Past mining activities have left large instream and floodplain pits which act as sediment traps during gravel transport events. Gravels slowly accumulate in the pits, and because these gravels are not transported through these reaches, the bed surface downstream coarsens and/or incises.

Eligible Proposals: Proposals are being solicited for projects to replace gravel in areas where natural sediment deposition processes have been interupted and acquatic habitats have degraded. Projects should be based on an understanding of sediment transport processes in the area of consideration (see Geographic Area).

Geographic Area: Throughout the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta system.

Recommended Funding: Up to $500,000.

Coordination: Proposals should be coordinated with State and Federal efforts to implement CVPIA and other efforts to rehabilitate natural hydrology and sediment transport processes.

III.E.1 Fish Harvest

Background: There is a need to develop fisheries management tools to minimize the impacts of recreational and commercial harvest on wild anandroumous fish stocks where they have experienced severe declines. These tools would not only assist in the recovery of the fish stocks but could help maintain viable commercial and recreational fishing industries by reducing the conflicts.

The harvest of hatchery-produced chinook salmon is constrained by the need to limit the harvest mortality of the sensitive wild stocks mixed with them. More selective fisheries targeting hatchery-derived fish could result in higher harvests and less mortality of wild stocks. One method that has been suggested to target harvest on hatchery fish has been mass-marking of all hatchery production to allow selective harvest of these fish. However, because wild fish mix with hatchery fish, fishermen are likely to hook wild fish in their pursuit of hatchery fish. If the proportion of a particular run of salmon (e.g., winter run) is very low, individual fish could potentially get hooked repeatedly and suffer mortality as a result. Information related to the estimated hooking mortality in both the commercial fishery and in the freshwater and saltwater recreational fishery is needed to evaluate potential effects of mass-marking. Techniques to minimize hooking mortality can also be effective tools to reduce any effects that may be identified with mass-marking.

Selectivity in salmon fisheries to minimize impacts on sensitive stocks can also be increased in a number of other ways. Some examples are development of better information on locations of sensitive stocks to more effectively target harvest and evaluation of different harvest techniques to determine if they increase selectivity through innovation.

Eligble Proposals: Proposals are being solicited to develop fisheries management tools to decrease the effects of commercial and recreational harvest on sensitive stocks while maintaining the important industries supported by harvest. These tools could include research to refine the estimates of harvest impacts on sensitive salmon populations, and to allow calculation of a fall run harvest rate, as well as research to estimate hooking mortality of wild salmon stocks as a result of both the commercial and recreational fisheries in marine, estuarine, and freshwater if hatchery fish were mass-marked. The results can be used to find ways to meet performance standards for commercial and sport salmon fisheries consistent with ecosystem restoration and with sustainable fishery goals (e.g., maximum allowable harvest impact on sensitive stocks such as winter run and spring run chinook salmon). Additional tagging and/or marking is not contemplated as part of this proposal. Applicants should be familiar with California commercial and recreational fisheries practices.

Geographic Area: Throughout the entire Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta system, as well as distant fisheries in which salmon originating in the Bay-Delta are caught.

Recommended Funding: up to $500,000.

E-029767

Coordination: Applicants should demonstrate coordination with applicable regulatory agencies (e.g. NMFS and CDFG).

Additional information: Proposals should be evaluated for funding based on the Interdisciplinary Panel's 1998 priority species and on the likelihood of ecological benefit (specifically, increased selectivity and reduced harvest impacts on sensitive stocks).

III.F.1 Species Life History Studies

Background: In order to identify key sressors on populations, additional information is needed regarding the life histories of green sturgeon, steelhead, and spring-run chinook salmon. This information is also necessary before successful restoration programs can be designed or implemented to benefit these species.

Eligible Proposals: Proposals are being solicited to fund research programs to identify key habitat needs and stressors on each life history stage of green sturgeon, steelhead, and spring-run chinook salmon. The research is to include field data and models for the purpose of restoring these species. Specific proposals are requested for each of the three species. Proposals should identify which life history stage is being evaluated and extent of geographic scope.

Geographic Area: Throughout the entire Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta system.

Recommended Funding: up to $600,000

Coordination: Proposals should include coordination with on-going research efforts on the species of interest and on other species in the same geographic area.

III.G.1 Watershed Planning

Background: CALFED recognizes the importance of watershed stewardship as a component of the Bay-Delta solution, and wants to support watershed projects that are community based, with active local leadership and the participation of diverse interests. CALFED has allocated funds to support watershed stewardship projects. These funds will support the development and implementation of local watershed management plans that support those priority species and habitats identified in the RFP. Project applicants are expected to be, but are not limited to, Resource Conservation Districts, Watershed Conservancies, Coordinated Resource Management Programs, non-profit organizations, local governments and others.

Eligible Proposals: Proposals will be solicited to fund the development and implementation of restoration projects or plans by new or existing watershed groups.

Geographic Area: Throughout the entire Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta system.

Recommended Funding: up to $1,550,000

Coordination: Proposals should include coordination with representatives from agencies such as ACOE, Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), and NMFS, environmental groups, and local watershed groups.

Watershed Stewardship Selection Criteria: In addition to the criteria identified in this RFP concerning priority species and habitats, watershed management projects must address the following additional selection criteria:

- Contribute to ongoing local watershed management, resource stewardship and restoration
- Be consistent with CALFED principles and goals
- Foster community involvement in CALFED planning and implementation
- Be community-based, including local leadership and the participation of diverse interests
- Address multiple ecosystem issues, such as habitat enhancement, rangeland management agricultural practices, urban development, and surface and groundwater quality
- "Leverage" other funding sources to provide for ongoing implementation
- Foster collaboration among multiple interests
- Be consistent with related resource protection activities
- Measure success and provide for necessary monitoring

Selection Process: EPA, in coordination with CALFED, will facilitate a selection process that involves a balanced panel of CALFED agencies and stakeholders to provide funding to support locally-let efforts to develop and implement watershed plans for key tributaries of the Central Valley and Bay-Delta watershed.

E-029770

III.H.1 Education

Background: Building support and understanding of the need for restoration of the ecosystem is critical to the success of these efforts. Many of the concepts in habitat restoration are new and innovative and the public needs to understand them before they will support the need for habitat restoration. An education program would help the public understand the problems, would highlight the need to protect and restore the ecosystem in a message, and would increase the acceptance of innovative restoration techniques. Education efforts need to be simple, understandable, and make a personal connection. This may cause individuals, and ultimately communities, to become active participants in local protection and/or restoration efforts. Should this end result be achieved, it will improve CALFED's interactions with communities and local watershed groups.

Proposed Action: Proposals are being solicited for educational programs related to the Bay-Delta ecosystem. Appropriate types of educational programs include Adopt-a-Watershed, internships, mentoring, and habitat restoration projects that provide training opportunities.

Examples of appropriate educational activities:

1. Adopt-a-Watershed programs provide opportunities for local citizens and communities to get involved in protecting and enhancing local natural resources. Not only do these programs provide great educational benefits to both children and adults, they also provide an understanding of the resource management decisions faced by the agencies. Adopt-a-Watershed programs may evolve into watershed conservancies if given the financial resources and encouragement to do so.

2. As the ecosystem restoration field continues to grow, there will be a need to recruit skilled high school and college graduates. Hands-on experience through internships and mentoring programs will provide these students with an insight into this type of work and help guide their career choice. Internship and mentoring programs may be overseen by federal or state resource agencies, non-profit groups, or local agencies such as Resource Conservation Districts.

3. There may be a shortage of well-qualified personnel available to work at the grass roots level to implement the many restoration projects funded through Category III or identified as part of CALFED's Ecosystem Restoration Program Plan. In many cases, the actual restoration work is envisioned to be completed by non-agency personnel. In order to develop a well-qualified workforce, it is appropriate to develop and implement projects that provide training for volunteers and habitat restoration technicians who can work with local groups and conservancies.

Geographic Area: Throughout the Sacramento River watershed, San Joaquin River watershed, Delta, Suisun Bay, and North Delta.

Recommended Funding: up to $300,000

Coordination: Proposals should include coordination with any local conservancy, public education group, or environmental group which has existing public education programs in place. This funding is not intended to duplicate existing programs, but to fill in the gaps.

III.I.1 Small Screen Evaluations: Alternatives and Biological Priorities

Background: There are a large number of relatively small diversions diverting water from the Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers and their tributaries. These smaller diversions have the potential to entrain juvenile fish but there is relatively little data that can be used to identify where the biological benefits would be the greatest in a program to screen smaller diversions.

The most effective means of preventing entrainment is to screen these diversions with a modern fish screen. Evaluations of alternative methods of preventing entrainment at larger diversions have not identified any effective solutions other than positive fish screens. However, when evaluating screening at smaller diversions under 25 cfs, there may be other techniques for preventing entrainment that could be cost effective in some situations.

Eligible Proposals: Proposals are being solicited that focus on development of information that can be used to prioritize efforts to screen small diversions. This can include determination of the biological benefits of screening small diversions through an evaluation of entrainment potential at several locations through field sampling. There are also locations where it is possible to evaluate a screened and an unscreened diversion. The proposals should document how locations are to be compared, number of locations to be evaluated, and methods and techniques to be used to evaluate results. The proposal should also document how the results could be used to develop a method to assign priority to small unscreened diversions.

Proposals are also being solicited to determine if there are other techniques, other than positive fish screens which can significantly reduce entrainment and to evaluate these techniques in an appropriate setting to assess their usefulness.

The applicant must have written permission from the owner of any diversion where they propose to sample.

Geographic Area: Throughout the Bay-Delta watershed and its tributaries.

Recommended Funding: Up to $200,000

Coordination: Actions need to be coordinated with USBR, NMFS, USFWS, DWR, DFG, and with local organizations, watershed conservancies, landowners and water districts. Input should be sought from groups involved in fish screening issues such as the Fish Facilities Team, the CVPIA's Anadromous Fish Screen Program, the Interagency Ecological Program's Agricultural Diversion Project Work Team, local Resource Conservation Districts, and local watershed groups.

E-029773