San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority

SAN FRANCISCO BAY
RESTORATION AUTHORITY

DRAFT

GRANT PROGRAM GUIDELINES

Grants Funded by Measure AA: The San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Measure

September 2019~~8~~

Contents

I. Introduction

A. The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority and the Restoration Act

The San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority ("Authority") is a regional government agency with a Governing Board made up of local elected officials appointed by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). Its purpose is to raise and allocate resources for the restoration, enhancement, protection, and enjoyment of wetlands and wildlife habitat in the San Francisco Bay and along its shoreline. The Authority was created by the California legislature in 2008 with the enactment of AB 2954 (Lieber), the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Act ("Restoration Act").

B. Measure AA: The San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Measure

After the Authority's Governing Board placed Measure AA: San Francisco Bay Clean Water, Pollution Prevention and Habitat Restoration Measure ("Measure AA") on the June 7, 2016 ballot, residents of the nine-county Bay Area voted with a 70% majority to pass it. This measure is a $12 parcel tax, which will raise approximately $25 million annually, or $500 million over twenty years, to fund shoreline projects that will protect and restore San Francisco Bay.

Measure AA proceeds will fund shoreline projects that protect and restore San Francisco Bay by: reducing trash, pollution and harmful toxins; improving water quality; restoring habitat for fish, birds, and wildlife; protecting communities from floods; and increasing shoreline public access and recreational areas. Proceeds will be disbursed via competitive grants, as outlined in these guidelines.

C. Grant Program Implementation

The Authority will make funding decisions at public meetings based on its enabling legislation and the requirements of Measure AA. As required by the Restoration Act (Section 66704.5(d)), the Authority shall solicit input from the Advisory Committee in adopting a procedure for evaluating project proposals, as well as in reviewing and assessing projects. Opportunities for public input will be provided at all meetings of the Governing Board and the Advisory Committee. The Advisory Committee Procedural Document, available on the Authority's website, provides more information on the Advisory Committee's roles and responsibilities, process for appointment, and current membership.

Authority staff supports the grant program by drafting grant program guidelines and requests for proposals, managing and participating in the application review process and presenting proposed projects to the Board. The California State Coastal Conservancy ("Conservancy") and ABAG, including the San Francisco Estuary Partnership ("SFEP"), provide staff services to the Authority, subject to the terms of a joint powers agreement, for purposes of implementing the Restoration Authority Act and Measure AA. The Conservancy provides Executive Officer services for the Authority under the direction of the Authority's Governing Board. ABAG provides a financial officer to act as treasurer to the Authority. The Conservancy and ABAG provide staff members to provide, under the direction of the Executive Officer, project management and administrative services, including accounting and legal support, within total general government expenditures of no more than 5% of the funds raised by Measure AA, as set forth in the text of the measure.

D. Grant Program Oversight

As stated in Measure AA, under section 3.C., Accountability and Oversight: "The Authority shall prepare annual written reports that show: (i) the amount of funds collected and expended from Special Tax proceeds, and (ii) the status of any projects or programs required or authorized to be funded from the proceeds of the Special Tax, as identified above. The report shall comply with Government Code section 50075.3, be posted on the Authority's website, and be submitted to the Advisory Committee for review and comment." The Advisory Committee provides advice to the Authority on all aspects of its activities to ensure maximum benefit, value, and transparency.

In addition, Measure AA requires the Restoration Authority to publish annual financial statements and commission independent annual audits, by preparing annual written reports showing the amount of funds collected and expended and the status of any projects or programs. An Independent Citizens Oversight Committee made up of Bay Area residents will annually publish a review of the Authority's audits and program and financial reports. The Independent Citizens Oversight Committee Procedural Document, available on the Authority's website, provides more information on the Oversight Committee's roles and responsibilities, process for appointment, and membership.

II. Program Purpose, Project Eligibility and Prioritization Criteria

A. Purpose of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Grant Program Guidelines

These San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Grant Program Guidelines ("SFBRA Grant Guidelines") establish the process and criteria that the Authority will use to solicit applications, evaluate proposals, and award grants, pursuant to Measure AA and the Restoration Act. All projects funded by the Authority with funds generated from Measure AA must be consistent with the Authority's enabling legislation and Measure AA. These SFBRA Grant Guidelines interpret the requirements applicable to projects funded under Measure AA and describe the project evaluation process for those projects. These SFBRA Grant Guidelines are adopted pursuant to the Restoration Act and may be updated periodically by the Governing Board.

B. Project Eligibility

Eligibility is based on a combination of requirements of the Restoration Act and Measure AA. (See Appendix A for relevant sections of the Restoration Act. The full text of Measure AA is available at http://sfbayrestore.org/docs/BallotMeasureLanguage.pdf.)

Eligible project activities must be consistent with the Restoration Act (66704.5(b)), which states:

> *An eligible project shall do at least one of the following:*
> *(1) Restore, protect, or enhance tidal wetlands, managed ponds, or natural habitats on the shoreline in the San Francisco Bay area, excluding the Delta primary zone.*
> *(2) Build or enhance shoreline levees or other flood management features that are part of a project to restore, enhance, or protect tidal wetlands, managed ponds, or natural habitats identified in paragraph (1).*
> *(3) Provide or improve public access or recreational amenities that are part of a project to restore, enhance, or protect tidal wetlands, managed ponds, or natural habitats identified in paragraph (1).*

In addition, revenues generated by Measure AA may be used solely for the purpose of supporting the programs and priorities and other purposes set forth in the Measure and shall be spent only in accordance with the procedures and limitations set forth in the Measure, as cited below.

Under this Measure, the Authority may fund projects along the Bay shorelines within the Authority's jurisdiction, which consists of the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano and Sonoma and the City and County of San Francisco. The shorelines include the shorelines of San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Strait, Suisun Bay, and most of the Northern Contra Costa County Shoreline to the edge of the Delta Primary Zone. These projects shall advance the following programs:

1. Safe, Clean Water and Pollution Prevention Program

The purpose of this program to be funded under the Measure is to remove pollution, trash and harmful toxins from the Bay in order to provide clean water for fish, birds, wildlife, and people.

a. Improve water quality by reducing pollution and engaging in restoration activities, protecting public health and making fish and wildlife healthier.
b. Reduce pollution levels through shoreline cleanup and trash removal from the Bay.
c. Restore wetlands that provide natural filters and remove pollution from the Bay's water.
d. Clean and enhance creek outlets where they flow into the Bay.

2. Vital Fish, Bird and Wildlife Habitat Program

The purpose of this program to be funded under the Measure is to significantly improve wildlife habitat that will support and increase vital populations of fish, birds, and other wildlife in and around the Bay.

a. Enhance the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge, shoreline parks and open space preserves, and other protected lands in and around the Bay, providing expanded and improved habitat for fish, birds and mammals.
b. Protect and restore wetlands and other Bay and shoreline habitats to benefit wildlife, including shorebirds, waterfowl and fish.
c. Provide for stewardship, maintenance and monitoring of habitat restoration projects in and around the Bay, to ensure their ongoing benefits to wildlife and people.

3. Integrated Flood Protection Program

The purpose of this program to be funded under the Measure is to use natural habitats to protect communities along the Bay's shoreline from the risks of severe coastal flooding caused by storms and high water levels.

a. Provide nature-based flood protection through wetland and habitat restoration along the Bay's edge and at creek outlets that flow to the Bay.
b. Build and/or improve flood protection levees that are a necessary part of wetland restoration activities, to protect existing shoreline communities, agriculture, and infrastructure.

4. Shoreline Public Access Program

The purpose of this program to be funded under the Measure is to enhance the quality of life of Bay Area residents, including those with disabilities, through safer and improved public access, as part of and compatible with wildlife habitat restoration projects in and around the Bay.

a. Construct new, repair existing and/or replace deteriorating public access trails, signs, and related facilities along the shoreline and manage these public access facilities.

b. *Provide interpretive materials and special outreach events about pollution prevention, wildlife habitat, public access, and flood protection, to protect the Bay's health and encourage community engagement.*

See Appendix B for definitions and discussion of how these eligibility criteria will be applied.

C. Prioritization Criteria

The Authority must ensure that Measure AA's revenue is spent in the most efficient and effective manner, consistent with the public interest and in compliance with existing law.

Measure AA states:

The Authority shall give priority to projects that:

a. *Have the greatest positive impact on the Bay as a whole, in terms of clean water, wildlife habitat and beneficial use to Bay Area residents.*
b. *Have the greatest long-term impact on the Bay, to benefit future generations.*
c. *Provide for geographic distribution across the region and ensure that there are projects funded in each of the nine counties in the San Francisco Bay Area over the life of Measure AA.*
d. *Increase impact value by leveraging state and federal resources and public/private partnerships.*
e. *Benefit economically disadvantaged communities.*
f. *Benefit the region's economy, including local workforce development, employment opportunities for Bay Area residents, and nature-based flood protection for critical infrastructure and existing shoreline communities.*
g. *Work with local organizations and businesses to engage youth and young adults and assist them in gaining skills related to natural resource protection.*
h. *Incorporate monitoring, maintenance and stewardship to develop the most efficient and effective strategies for restoration and achievement of intended benefits.*
i. *Meet the selection criteria of the Coastal Conservancy's San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program and are consistent with the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's coastal management program and with the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture's implementation strategy.*

Project prioritization is based on a combination of requirements of the Restoration Act and Measure AA. See Appendix C for definitions and discussion of how these prioritization criteria will be applied.

D. Potential Project List and Map

Using EcoAtlas' Project Tracker tool, the Authority, the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture, and the San Francisco Estuary Institute have worked together to produce a list and map showing projects that could potentially be supported with grant funds from Measure AA, which would be expended in accordance with these grant guidelines. (The list is available at https://www.ecoatlas.org/groups/63~~http://sfbayrestore.org/docs/Projects.pdf~~; the map is available at https://www.ecoatlas.org/regions/group/63~~http://sfbayrestore.org/docs/Map.pdf~~.)

This list of projects that are potentially eligible for Authority funding will be used to help inform the Authority and its staff of the number, timing and funding needs of the projects that may apply for funding. The Authority's project list will help guide the development of requests for proposals, as well as their timing. However, neither the presence nor the absence of a project on the Authority's list will have any bearing on its prioritization for funding

The project list and map will be updated continuously, as projects are submitted. The Authority staff will seek nominations for additional projects to be added to the list via emails and other outreach to public agencies and nongovernmental organizations engaged in bay restoration work. Nominated projects will be evaluated for their consistency with the purposes of the Authority's enabling legislation and Measure AA (Appendix B).

III. Grant Application Process and Timeline

A. Solicitation Planning

Authority staff will draft requests for proposals and evaluation guidelines. These draft documents will be provided to the Advisory Committee for their review. Any necessary revisions will be made by Authority staff before being presented to the Governing Board for review. Revised draft documents and a summary of Advisory Committee recommendations will be presented to the Governing Board at a public meeting for its consideration and potential adoption.

B. Project Solicitation

At least once each year, and twice each year subject to the availability of and demand for funds, a Request for Proposals, to be funded with funds generated by Measure AA, will be posted on the Authority's website and sent out to the Authority's mailing lists.

C. Optional Pre-Proposal Consultation

Applicants are strongly encouraged to consult with Authority staff prior to submitting their applications. Pre-proposal consultation will be available to any potential applicant but will not be required.

D. Application Review and Evaluation

1. Completeness

Grant applications will be initially reviewed by Authority staff for completeness. Incomplete grant applications will be returned to the applicant. Applicants may choose to complete their application and resubmit it within five business days or in a future solicitation period.

2. Screening

The Authority staff will screen complete grant applications to ensure that:

- The project and potential grantee meets the Authority's eligibility requirements as outlined in the Authority's enabling legislation; and
- The project is consistent with supporting the programs and priorities and other purposes set forth in Measure AA.

Applications that do not pass the screening process will not proceed to the review process. Authority staff will return the application. The applicant may request feedback from Authority staff on whether and how the proposal could be modified to meet the screening criteria and may resubmit it in a future solicitation period. The initial screening will also eliminate projects that will not have environmental documents completed in time to be presented to the Governing Board within the next 12 months.

3. Review

Complete applications that have passed the screening process will be reviewed and evaluated by a minimum of three professionals with relevant expertise in the Authority's program areas (as described in the enabling legislation and Measure AA). Reviewers may include, but are not limited to, public agency staff, consultants, academics, Authority staff and Advisory Committee members. All reviewers who are not subject to the Political Reform Act will be required to document that they do

not have a conflict of interest in reviewing any proposals. All reviewers will evaluate each proposal in accordance with the evaluation guidelines that will be developed as described above.

E. Grant Award

Authority staff will determine which qualified applications to recommend to the Governing Board for funding and the amount of funding, taking into account the project's merit and urgency relative to other eligible projects, the total amount of funding available for projects, the readiness of the projects to proceed, and whether the Governing Board will be able to make any necessary findings under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The Authority expects that it will take an average of six months from application submittal to Governing Board approval and at least one additional month for execution of the grant agreement.

F. Board Meetings

The Governing Board will consider recommended grants and make any and all grant approvals at public meetings that are noticed in advance, with meeting materials made available in advance to the public. The Authority typically holds four public meetings per calendar year, though this number is subject to change as board meetings are held on an as-needed basis. The meeting schedule is published on the Authority's website. The agenda for each public meeting will be published on the Authority's website at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting. Staff will prepare a report for each proposed grant presented to the Governing Board at a public meeting. The staff report will describe the project, will explain how the project is consistent with and advances the purposes of the Authority's enabling legislation and Measure AA, and will be made available to the public in advance of the meeting.

G. Grant Agreement

Once the Governing Board has approved a grant at a public meeting, Authority staff will prepare a grant agreement setting forth the terms and conditions of the grant. The grantee must sign the grant agreement and comply with its conditions in order to receive funds.

IV. Additional Information

A. Available Funding

The Authority expects to generate approximately $25 million each year for twenty years for a total of $500 million, which will be disbursed through grant rounds as outlined in these guidelines, with no more than 5% going to administrative costs.

B. Additional Project Considerations

Where appropriate, grantees will be required to provide signage informing the public that the project received Authority grant funding. This requirement will be addressed in the grant agreement.

C. Grant Provisions

Following Governing Board approval of a grant, staff will prepare a grant agreement with detailed conditions specific to the project. The grant agreement must be signed by the grantee before funds will be disbursed. Several typical grant agreement provisions are:

- Actual awards are conditional upon funds being available from the Authority.
- Grantees must submit a detailed project work program and budget and the names of any contractors.
- Grantees must provide proof that all necessary permits have been obtained.
- Grant funds will only be paid in arrears on a reimbursement basis.
- Grantees must submit invoices and progress reports regularly.

- Grantees must meet project completion requirements (typically grants will include a 10% withholding that is not paid until the project is completed).
- Grantees may be required to reimburse the Authority for some or all of the disbursed grant funds if the project is not satisfactorily completed.
- Grantees must provide proof of liability insurance and name the Authority as an additional insured.
- In executing the project for which the grant has been given, grantees will comply with all terms set forth in the grant agreement and all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

In addition, the Authority requires grantees to negotiate, enter into and execute a project labor agreement with the local building trades council or councils, subject to certain conditions and exceptions outlined in its Resolution 22, adopted November 30, 2016.

D. Environmental Documents

The Authority is required to comply with the CEQA and all other applicable environmental laws. Grant applicants should consider whether their proposed project will trigger the need for an environmental impact report or negative declaration, or whether a CEQA exemption applies. How CEQA applies and the status of CEQA compliance must be addressed in the grant application. Grant applicants that are not potential CEQA lead agencies, e.g., nongovernmental organizations, should work with a lead agency to determine whether their proposed project will trigger the need for an environmental impact report or negative declaration, or whether a CEQA exemption applies. Additionally, grant applicants should consider all other applicable environmental laws, on a project by project basis, report accordingly, and address compliance in the grant application.

E. Project Monitoring and Reporting

All grant applications must include a monitoring and reporting component that explains how the effectiveness of the project will be measured and reported. The monitoring and reporting component will vary depending on the nature of the project and may include regional monitoring approaches as appropriate. The grant application evaluation will assess the robustness of the proposed monitoring program. In addition, Authority staff will work with grantees to develop appropriate monitoring and reporting templates and procedures.

All projects must complete a final report, including a lessons-learned summary report fully and clearly describing lessons learned under all phases of the project including design, construction and monitoring. Lessons learned must focus on project trouble areas and issues to be addressed as a guide to future projects to avoid these issues to the extent possible.

F. Performance Measures

The Authority currently uses performance measures, such as acres of habitat *expected to be* restored and miles of Bay Trail *expected to be* constructed, to track the expected outcomes of activities funded by the Measure AA grant program. The Authority's annual report includes a performance measures summary that combines data on expected outcomes from all projects funded. In order to efficiently capture this information, the Authority requires grant applicants to provide performance measure data in the application. Applicants need only provide data for those performance measures that are relevant to their projects. During application review, performance measure data will be considered in the context of the project purpose and will not directly influence scoring. When the project is complete, the grantee must provide final numbers on the actual outcomes of the project, such acres of habitat actually restored and miles of Bay Trail actually constructed.

Appendix A: Relevant Sections of the San Francisco Bay Restoration Authority Act

(The full text of the Restoration Act is available at http://www.sfbayrestore.org/docs/EnablingLegislation.pdf.)

1. Project Eligibility
   This section cites the requirements for a project to be eligible for funding under the Restoration Act:

   A. Definitions (California Government Code Section 66701):

   "'Delta primary zone' means the area described in Section 29728 of the Public Resources Code."

   "'San Francisco Bay Area' means the area within the State Coastal Conservancy's San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program created pursuant to Chapter 4.5 (commencing with Section 31160) of Division 21 of the Public Resources Code and includes the Counties of Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, Solano, and Sonoma."

   B. Eligible Grantees (Section 66704.5(a)):

   "The authority may raise funds and award grants to public and private entities, including, but not limited to, owners or operators of shoreline parcels in the San Francisco Bay area, excluding the Delta primary zone, for eligible projects in the counties within the authority's jurisdiction."

   C. Eligible Project Activities and Locations (66704.5(b)):

   "An eligible project shall do at least one of the following:
   (1) Restore, protect, or enhance tidal wetlands, managed ponds, or natural habitats on the shoreline in the San Francisco Bay area, excluding the Delta primary zone.
   (2) Build or enhance shoreline levees or other flood management features that are part of a project to restore, enhance, or protect tidal wetlands, managed ponds, or natural habitats identified in paragraph (1).
   (3) Provide or improve public access or recreational amenities that are part of a project to restore, enhance, or protect tidal wetlands, managed ponds, or natural habitats identified in paragraph (1)."

   D. Eligible Project Phases (66704.5(e))

   "Grants awarded pursuant to subdivision (a) may be used to support all phases of planning, construction, monitoring, operation, and maintenance for projects that are eligible pursuant to subdivision (b)."

2. Prioritization Criteria (66704.5(c))

"The Authority will give priority to projects that, to the greatest extent possible, meet the selection criteria of the State Coastal Conservancy's San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program in accordance with subdivision (c) of Section 31163 of the Public Resources Code, and are consistent with the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission coastal management program for the San Francisco Bay segment of the California coastal zone and the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture implementation strategy updated list of Ongoing and Potential Wetland Habitat Projects."

Appendix B: Definitions and Clarifications of Eligibility Criteria

Eligibility is based on a combination of requirements of the Restoration Act (Appendix A) and Measure AA.

1. Eligible Project Locations

According to Measure AA, to be eligible for funding, projects must be located "along the Bay shorelines" within one of the nine Bay Area counties. In addition, Measure AA states, "The shorelines include the shorelines of San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Strait, Suisun Bay, and most of the Northern Contra Costa County Shoreline to the edge of the Delta Primary Zone." Thus, the geographic extent of the shoreline is clear.

A. Definition of "Along the Bay Shorelines"

The question is how far from the shoreline a project may be located. "Baylands" is the technical term adopted by the science community within *Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals* (1999) to refer to the areas adjacent to the Bay that are of primary ecological important to it; it defines these as "the lands that lie between the maximum and minimum elevations of the tides over multiyear cycles, including those areas that would be covered by the tides in the absence of levees or other unnatural structures." Additionally, the 2015 Science Update to the goals report *(The Baylands and Climate Change: What We Can Do*) recognizes the importance of transition zones moving inland above the extent of high tide, as well as the need to plan ahead for the effects of sea level rise. Therefore, the Authority defines "along the Bay shorelines" to include these important lands adjacent to the Bay.

B. Definition of "Creek Outlets"

Measure AA states that eligible projects may: "Clean and enhance creek outlets where they flow into the Bay" or "Provide nature-based flood protection through wetland and habitat restoration along the Bay's edge and at creek outlets that flow to the Bay." However, these descriptions of eligible project activities still fall under more general requirement for projects to be located "along Bay shorelines." Therefore, the Authority interprets the language of Measure AA regarding creek outlets to mean that projects located in rivers or creeks also must be located along the Bay, i.e. adjacent to the part of the river or creek subject to tidal action. This area is also referred to as being below the head of tide. Similar consideration of the value of transitional habitats and the effects of future sea level rise should be made when considering the extent of creek outlets.

C. Conclusion

To be eligible, projects must be located within the nine Bay Area counties along the shorelines of San Francisco Bay, San Pablo Bay, Carquinez Strait, Suisun Bay, and most of the Northern Contra Costa County Shoreline to the edge of, but not including, the Delta Primary Zone, that are in areas consistent with guidance provided in the *Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Science Update* (2015) and *Subtidal Habitat Goals Report* (2010), including:

- In subtidal areas (lying below mean low tide), within a reasonable distance of the shoreline;
- In baylands, i.e., areas that lie between the maximum and minimum elevations of the tides over multiyear cycles, including those areas that would be covered by the tides

in the absence of levees or other unnatural structures, including the portion of creeks or rivers located below the head of tide; or

- On uplands adjacent to potential or actual tidal wetlands that can provide transitional habitat and/or marsh migration space, as well as areas that are needed to enhance the project's resilience to projected sea level rise.

2. Eligible Project Activities

The Authority will fund activities described under the four program areas in Measure AA. In addition, the Authority interprets eligible project activities according to the Restoration Act, as described below.

A. Habitat Projects

The Restoration Act calls for funding projects that "restore, protect, or enhance tidal wetlands, managed ponds, or natural habitats" (Section 66704(b)). The Authority defines "natural habitats" as those consistent with existing guidance on baylands, riparian and subtidal habitats (see relevant local or regional plans, Appendix E); these can include habitats that have been modified by human activity but still provide tangible wildlife support and/or ecological value. Projects should restore, protect or enhance habitat for native species, including native plants.

B. Flood Management and Public Access Projects

The Restoration Act states that eligible projects include those that provide or improve flood management features or public access or recreational amenities "that are part of a project to restore, enhance, or protect tidal wetlands, managed ponds, or natural habitats" (Section 66704.5(b)). The Authority interprets this to mean that such projects will be considered eligible for funding if they are part of a restoration project that is in the planning stages, underway, or partially complete. In general, such elements will be considered part of a restoration project if they are included in the plan, environmental documents and/or permits for the particular habitat restoration project with which they are associated. Therefore, closing a trail gap or extending a project levee are eligible activities if the elements are or were part of a habitat restoration project as described above.

3. Eligible Project Phases

According to the Restoration Act, grant funds may be used to support "all phases of planning, construction, monitoring, operation, and maintenance of [eligible projects]." The Authority interprets "all phases of planning [and] construction" of a project" to include acquisition, planning, design, environmental studies, permitting, construction, monitoring and evaluation, operation, scientific studies as part of the project to guide adaptive management, and maintenance. In addition, an acquisition may be considered an eligible project.

The Authority will consider funding acquisitions (fee and/or less-than-fee (e.g. easement) interests in land where demonstrably significant opportunity exists to either protect existing natural baylands resources from loss, degradation or development or to meaningfully enhance or restore baylands resources and/or provide habitat-related public access and flood benefits[1]. In

[1] Please include details of the restoration benefits of the project in the project description section of the application.

general, the Authority will seek to fund the least costly, most efficient and effective method of securing the long-term benefits of site tenure; acquisitions will therefore be judged on the tangibility, significance and likelihood of success of the eventual restoration or enhancement opportunity. In addition to the eligibility and prioritization criteria for any other Measure AA-funded project, eligible acquisitions must:

- Be transacted with willing sellers;
- Be for no more than fair market value as determined in an approved appraisal pursued at or above USPAP standards;
- Have legal access to the property and be acceptably free and clear of defects of title;
- Be free of contamination that could impact the projected use and benefits of the property, as demonstrated through a Phase I environmental assessment or higher-level site analysis;
- Be secured in perpetuity for the Measure AA-purposes. For any acquisition by a private entity, a third-party public entity must partner to secure the public's interest in the acquisition.
- If an easement, include terms sufficient to achieve the protection, restoration, or public access purposes of the easement.

4. Eligible Grantees

According to the Restoration Act (Section 66704.5(a)), the Authority may award grants to "public and private entities, which include but are not limited to owners and operators of shoreline parcels in the San Francisco Bay Area." The Authority interprets this to mean that eligible grantees also include federal, state, local agencies, tribal governments, and nonprofit organizations.

5. Additional Eligibility Considerations

A. Voluntary vs. Mitigation Projects

The Restoration Authority will primarily fund voluntary habitat restoration projects. The Authority will not fund project impacts that are not compensated on-site as part of the restoration project (e.g. through private mitigation banks or other off-site mitigation actions). However, the Authority may fund the on-site compensatory requirements of a project that is eligible for Measure AA funds and that demonstrates net positive benefits. The Authority may contribute to a project that is making use of mitigation funds, but the Authority's share of the funds must pay for an incremental improvement beyond compensation for damages that may have occurred elsewhere as part of the mitigation requirements.

B. Beneficial Use of Dredged Sediment

The Authority may provide grant funds to support the delivery of dredged material to a restoration project that requires sediment in order to achieve habitat restoration goals. Sediment may be needed to raise elevations of subsided lands, provide for ecotones or transitional habitat along levees, provide for berms or islands within a restoration plain, or for other purposes. Restoration projects that include beneficial use of dredged sediment are eligible to apply for Authority funds and should describe the ecological purpose of the dredged sediment and the estimated costs for delivery and placement of dredged sediment.

Much of the dredging in the Bay Area is conducted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, with other dredging conducted by ports, local agencies, or private entities, such as refineries. The

Corps must dispose of the sediment in the least cost, environmentally acceptable manner (the Federal Standard). The Federal Standard is often the Deep Ocean Disposal Site or In-Bay Disposal sites. The Authority's grant funding is not intended to go towards the cost of dredging navigation channels, ports, or marinas. However, the Authority's grant funding may support the incremental cost, above the Federal Standard, to deliver dredged material to a restoration site, and the placement, management, and sculpting of material on-site. For more information about beneficial use of dredged sediment, please refer to the *Long-Term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredged Material in the San Francisco Bay Region, Management Plan* (2001).

Appendix C: Definitions and Clarifications of Prioritization Criteria

Project prioritization is based on a combination of requirements of the Restoration Act and Measure AA.

1. The Restoration Act

The Restoration Act (66704.5(c)) states:

In awarding grants pursuant to subdivision (a), the authority shall give priority to projects that, to the greatest extent possible, meet the selection criteria of the State Coastal Conservancy's San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program in accordance with subdivision (c) of Section 31163 of the Public Resources Code, and are consistent with the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission coastal management program for the San Francisco Bay segment of the California coastal zone and the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture implementation strategy updated list of Ongoing and Potential Wetland Habitat Projects.

(Measure AA repeats this in a slightly different form: "The Authority shall give priority to projects that…[m]eet the selection criteria of the Coastal Conservancy's San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program and are consistent with the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's coastal management program and with the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture's implementation strategy."

A. San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy's Selection Criteria.

The Restoration Act states that the Authority will "give priority to projects that, to the greatest extent possible, meet the selection criteria of and are consistent with the State Coastal Conservancy's San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy program (in accordance with subdivision (c) of Section 31163 of the Public Resources Code)." These criteria are:

1. "Are supported by adopted local or regional plans;
2. Are multijurisdictional or serve a regional constituency;
3. Can be implemented in a timely way;
4. Provide opportunities for benefits that could be lost if the project is not quickly implemented;
5. Include matching funds from other sources of funding or assistance."

The Authority interprets "local or regional plans" to include, but not be limited to the following (see Appendix E for full citations):

- *Restoring the Estuary: An Implementation Strategy for the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture*
- *Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Update*
- *Recovery Plan for Tidal Marsh Ecosystems for Northern and Central California*
- *San Francisco Bay Subtidal Habitat Goals Report*
- *Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan ("Estuary Blueprint")*
- *Surviving the Storm*
- *San Francisco Bay Trail Plan*
- *San Francisco Bay Trail Design Guidelines & Toolkit*
- *Enhanced San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail Plan*

- *Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin (Basin Plan)*
- *Long-Term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredged Material in the San Francisco Bay Region, Management Plan*

The Authority interprets "can be implemented in a timely way" to mean that projects are demonstrably at a stage where they will be able to proceed upon the receipt of funding, considering factors such as site control, landowner agreement, support of the public, design constraints, permitting considerations, security of match funding. For initial planning or design phases, these factors may be judged relative to the ability to implement the project once planning is completed. Similarly, "benefits that could be lost" may be interpreted in the context of a project's full implementation.

B. Coastal Management Program for San Francisco Bay

The Restoration Act states that the Authority will "give priority to projects that, to the greatest extent possible, meet the selection criteria of and are consistent with… the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission coastal management program for the San Francisco Bay segment of the California coastal zone." This coastal management program is based on the provisions and policies of the McAteer-Petris Act, the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act of 1977, the San Francisco Bay Plan, the Suisun Marsh Protection Plan, and the Commission's administrative regulations. The McAteer-Petris Act and the Bay Plan apply to the entire Bay, while the Suisun Marsh Preservation Act and Suisun Marsh Protection Plan apply only to Suisun Marsh. The Bay Plan elements most relevant to this grant program (see Appendix D) include policies related to habitat goals, climate change resilience, setting goals and success criteria, monitoring and adaptive management, public access, and mosquito abatement. Consistency with these policies is required in order to obtain a permit for project construction from the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission.

C. San Francisco Bay Joint Venture Implementation Strategy Updated List of Ongoing and Potential Wetland Habitat Projects

The Restoration Act states that the Authority will "give priority to projects that, to the greatest extent possible, meet the selection criteria of and are consistent with… the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture Implementation Strategy Updated List of Ongoing and Potential Wetland Habitat Projects." The Implementation Strategy is referenced in Appendix E. More information about the Joint Venture's list of priority projects and criteria used to select them can be found in the "Projects" section of their website, http://www.sonic.net/~sfbayjv/projects.php. Applicants must either demonstrate that their project is on Joint Venture's list or consult with the Joint Venture prior to applying for funding to assess and characterize their consistency with the selection criteria of the list.

2. Measure AA Prioritization Criteria

Measure AA states:

The Authority shall give priority to projects that:

a. Have the greatest positive impact on the Bay as a whole, in terms of clean water, wildlife habitat and beneficial use to Bay Area residents.

b. Have the greatest long-term impact on the Bay, to benefit future generations.

c. *Provide for geographic distribution across the region and ensure that there are projects funded in each of the nine counties in the San Francisco Bay Area over the life of Measure AA.*
d. *Increase impact value by leveraging state and federal resources and public/private partnerships.*
e. *Benefit economically disadvantaged communities.*
f. *Benefit the region's economy, including local workforce development, employment opportunities for Bay Area residents, and nature-based flood protection for critical infrastructure and existing shoreline communities.*
g. *Work with local organizations and businesses to engage youth and young adults and assist them in gaining skills related to natural resource protection.*
h. *Incorporate monitoring, maintenance and stewardship to develop the most efficient and effective strategies for restoration and achievement of intended benefits.*
i. *Meet the selection criteria of the Coastal Conservancy's San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy Program and are consistent with the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission's coastal management program and with the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture's implementation strategy.*

A. Greatest Positive Impact

Projects that "have the greatest positive impact on the Bay as a whole, in terms of clean water, wildlife habitat and beneficial use to Bay Area residents" are projects that demonstrate, through the use of established best available scientific knowledge, adopted regional and local plans, and relevant studies, the greatest potential benefits to the Bay ecosystem. In addition, they include restoration projects that provide co-benefits, including, but not limited to, improved flood protection, public access and recreational amenities, beneficial reuse of dredged material and carbon sequestration.

With respect to flood protection, the Restoration Authority will prioritize funding for the use of nature-based flood protection through restoration of wetlands and transitional habitats. A second priority for funding will be hybrid flood protection strategies, such as horizontal levees, that integrate habitat restoration with new or improved levees that are a necessary part of wetland restoration activities, to protect existing shoreline communities and other assets. However, the Authority may also fund flood protection necessary to a restoration project that is not integrated with habitat restoration.

~~The Restoration Authority will primarily fund voluntary habitat restoration projects. The Authority will not fund project impacts that are not compensated on-site as part of the restoration project (e.g. through private mitigation banks or other off-site mitigation actions). However, the Authority may fund the on-site compensatory requirements of a project that is eligible for Measure AA funds and that demonstrates net positive benefits. The Authority may contribute to a project that is making use of mitigation funds, but the Authority's share of the funds must pay for an incremental improvement beyond compensation for damages that may have occurred elsewhere as part of the mitigation requirements.~~

B. Greatest Long-Term Impact

Projects that "have the greatest long-term impact on the Bay, to benefit future generations" are those that best demonstrate an ability to provide benefits over long timeframes despite the potential for changing circumstances such as changes in freshwater supply, sediment delivery, species composition, and rising sea levels. Projects should use the best available

science to incorporate future climate variability, ideally providing resilience across multiple climate change scenarios.

C. Geographic Distribution

Projects that "provide for geographic distribution across the region" are those that contribute to Measures AA's funding distribution requirement. It states, "The Authority shall ensure that 50% of the total net revenue generated during the 20-year term of the Special Tax is allocated to the four Bay Area regions in proportion to each region's share of the Bay Area's population, as determined in the 2010 census. The minimum percentages that shall be allocated to each of the four Bay Area regions according to their share of the Bay Area's population are included below. The four Bay Area regions are defined as follows:

- North Bay (Sonoma, Marin, Napa and Solano Counties): 9% minimum allocation;
- East Bay (Alameda and Contra Costa Counties): 18% minimum allocation;
- West Bay (City and County of San Francisco and San Mateo County): 11% minimum allocation; and
- South Bay (Santa Clara County): 12% minimum allocation.

The remaining 50% of total net revenue shall be allocated consistent with all other provisions of Measure AA."

D. Benefits to Economically Disadvantaged Communities

An economically disadvantaged community (EDC) is defined as a community with a median household income less than 80% of the area median income (AMI). Within this set of low-income communities, communities of particular concern include those that: are historically underrepresented in environmental policymaking and/or projects, bear a disproportionate environmental and health burden, are most vulnerable to climate change impacts due to lack of resources required for community resilience, or are severely burdened by housing costs, increasing the risk of displacement.

A proposed project's ability to provide benefits to these communities will be judged on the basis of the direct involvement and support of local community groups; a demonstrated track record working within communities; the use of proven strategies to increase relevance of messaging and outreach[2]; and the ability to alleviate multiple stressors within communities, including, but not limited to, addressing the need for additional recreational amenities, resilience to climate change, reductions in pollution burden, greater civic engagement, and enhanced leadership development opportunities.

E. Workforce Development

The Authority will interpret this criterion in accordance with its policy on project labor agreements, adopted in November 2016.

F. Monitoring

[2] For examples of such strategies, see the State Coastal Conservancy's *Tips for Meaningful Community Engagement*, http://scc.ca.gov/files/2019/04/Tips-for-Meaningful-Community-Engagement.pdf.

The Authority will interpret this criterion to mean it will prioritize projects that commit to the regular assessment and reporting of project outcomes and include meaningful ways of sharing their results with the broader community.

Appendix D: Bay Plan Policies Most Relevant to the Grant Program

Note: The Bay Plan may be amended in 2019 to address the issue of fill for habitat restoration, as well as the issues of environmental justice and social equity. For the latest version of the Bay Plan, see http://www.bcdc.ca.gov/plans/sfbay_plan.html.

1. **Fish, Other Aquatic Organisms and Wildlife, Policy 3:** "In reviewing or approving habitat restoration programs the Commission should be guided by the recommendations in the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals report and should, where appropriate, provide for a diversity of habitats to enhance opportunities for a variety of associated native aquatic and terrestrial plant and animal species."
2. **Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats, Policy 4:** "Where feasible, former tidal marshes and tidal flats that have been diked from the Bay should be restored to tidal action in order to replace lost historic wetlands or should be managed to provide important Bay habitat functions, such as resting, foraging and breeding habitat for fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife. As recommended in the Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals report, around 65,000 acres of areas diked from the Bay should be restored to tidal action to maintain a healthy Bay ecosystem on a regional scale. Regional ecosystem targets should be updated periodically to guide conservation, restoration, and management efforts that result in a Bay ecosystem resilient to climate change and sea level rise. …The public should make every effort to acquire these lands for the purpose of habitat restoration and wetland migration."
3. **Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats, Policy 6:** "Any ecosystem restoration project should include clear and specific long-term and short-term biological and physical goals, and success criteria, and a monitoring program to assess the sustainability of the project. Design and evaluation of the project should include an analysis of: (a) how the system's adaptive capacity can be enhanced so that it is resilient to sea level rise and climate change; (b) the impact of the project on the Bay's sediment budget; (c) localized sediment erosion and accretion; (d) the role of tidal flows; (e) potential invasive species introduction, spread, and their control; (f) rates of colonization by vegetation; (g) the expected use of the site by fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife; (h) an appropriate buffer, where feasible, between shoreline development and habitats to protect wildlife and provide space for marsh migration as sea level rises; and (i) site characterization. If success criteria are not met, appropriate adaptive measures should be taken."
4. **Tidal Marshes and Tidal Flats, Policy 8:** "Based on scientific ecological analysis and consultation with the relevant federal and state resource agencies, a minor amount of fill may be authorized to enhance or restore fish, other aquatic organisms or wildlife habitat if the Commission finds that no other method of enhancement or restoration except filling is feasible.
5. **Subtidal Areas, Policy 3:** "Subtidal restoration projects should be designed to: (a) promote an abundance and diversity of fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife; (b) restore rare subtidal areas; (c) establish linkages between deep and shallow water and tidal and subtidal habitat in an effort to maximize habitat values for fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife; or (d) expand open water areas in an effort to make the Bay larger.
6. **Subtidal Areas, Policy 4:** "Any subtidal restoration project should include clear and specific long-term and short-term biological and physical goals, and success criteria and a monitoring program to assess the sustainability of the project. Design and evaluation of the project should include an analysis of: (a) the scientific need for the project; (b) the effects of relative sea level rise; (c) the impact of the project on the Bay's sediment budget; (d) localized sediment erosion and accretion; (e) the role of tidal flows; (f) potential invasive species introduction, spread and their control; (g) rates of colonization by vegetation, where applicable; (h) the expected use of the

site by fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife; and (i) characterization of and changes to local bathymetric features. If success criteria are not met, corrective measures should be taken."

7. **Public Access, Policy 4:** "Public access should be sited, designed and managed to prevent significant adverse effects on wildlife. To the extent necessary to understand the potential effects of public access on wildlife, information on the species and habitats of a proposed project site should be provided, and the likely human use of the access area analyzed. In determining the potential for significant adverse effects (such as impacts on endangered species, impacts on breeding and foraging areas, or fragmentation of wildlife corridors), site specific information provided by the project applicant, the best available scientific evidence, and expert advice should be used. In addition, the determination of significant adverse effects may also be considered within a regional context. Siting, design and management strategies should be employed to avoid or minimize adverse effects on wildlife, informed by the advisory principles in the Public Access Design Guidelines. If significant adverse effects cannot be avoided or reduced to a level below significance through siting, design and management strategies, then in lieu public access should be provided, consistent with the project and providing public access benefits equivalent to those that would have been achieved from on-site access. Where appropriate, effects of public access on wildlife should be monitored over time to determine whether revisions of management strategies are needed.
8. **Public Access, Policy 13:** "Public access should be integrated early in the planning and design of Bay habitat restoration projects to maximize public access opportunities and to avoid significant adverse effects on wildlife.
9. **Salt Ponds, Policy 3:** 'Any project for the restoration, enhancement or conversion of salt ponds to subtidal or wetland habitat should include clear and specific long-term and short-term biological and physical goals, success criteria, a monitoring program, and provisions for long-term maintenance and management needs. Design and evaluation of the project should include an analysis of:
    a) The anticipated habitat type that would result from pond conversion or restoration, and the predicted effects on the diversity, abundance and distribution of fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife;
    b) Potential fill activities, including the use of fill material such as sediments dredged from the Bay and rock, to assist restoration objectives;
    c) Flood management measures;
    d) Mosquito abatement measures;
    e) Measures to control non-native species;
    f) The protection of the services provided by existing public facilities and utilities such as power lines and rail lines;
    g) Siting, design and management of public access to maximize public access and recreational opportunities while avoiding significant adverse effects on wildlife; and
    h) Water quality protection measures that include management of highly saline discharges into the Bay; monitoring and management of mercury methylation and sediments with contaminants; managing the release of copper and nickel to the Bay; and the minimization of sustained low dissolved oxygen levels in managed ponds.
10. **Salt Ponds, Policy 5:** "To determine where and how much water surface area should be retained and how much public access should be provided consistent with any development proposal in a salt pond(s), a comprehensive planning process should be undertaken as part of the development

project that integrates with regional and local habitat restoration and management objectives and plans, and provides opportunities for collaboration among local, state and federal agencies, landowners, other private interests, and the public. In addition, the planning process should incorporate:

a) A baseline scientific assessment of existing and historical natural conditions and resource values of the pond(s);

b) Natural resource conservation objectives that will protect and enhance onsite and adjacent habitat and species diversity;

c) Provisions for public access and recreational opportunities appropriate to the land's use, size and existing and future habitat values; and

d) Flood and mosquito management measures.

11. **Managed Wetlands, Policy 3:** "Any project for the restoration, enhancement or conversion of managed wetlands to subtidal or wetland habitat should include clear and specific long-term and short-term biological and physical goals, success criteria, a monitoring program, and provisions for long-term maintenance and management needs. Design and evaluation of the project should include an analysis of:

    a) The anticipated habitat type that would result from managed wetland conversion or restoration, and the predicted effects on the diversity, abundance and distribution of fish, other aquatic organisms and wildlife;

    b) Potential fill activities, including the use of fill material such as sediments dredged from the Bay and rock, to assist restoration objectives;

    c) Flood management measures;

    d) Mosquito abatement measures;

    e) Measures to control non-native species;

    f) Opportunities for a diversity of public access and recreational activities; and

    g) Water quality protection measures that may include monitoring for constituents of concern, such as methylmercury.

12. **Dredging, Policy 5:** "To ensure adequate capacity for necessary Bay dredging projects and to protect Bay natural resources, acceptable non-tidal disposal sites should be secured and the Deep Ocean Disposal Site should be maintained. Further, dredging projects should maximize use of dredged material as a resource consistent with protecting and enhancing Bay natural resources, such as creating, enhancing, or restoring tidal and managed wetlands, creating and maintaining levees and dikes, providing cover and sealing material for sanitary landfills, and filling at approved construction sites.

13. **Dredging, Policy 11:**

    a) "A project that uses dredged material to create, restore, or enhance Bay or certain waterway natural resources should be approved only if:
        1. The Commission, based on detailed site-specific studies, appropriate to the size and potential impacts of the project, that include, but are not limited to, site morphology and physical conditions, biological considerations, the potential for fostering invasive species, dredged material stability, and engineering aspects of the project, determines all of the following:

a. the project would provide, in relationship to the project size, substantial net improvement in habitat for Bay species;

b. no feasible alternatives to the fill exist to achieve the project purpose with fewer adverse impacts to Bay resources;

c. the amount of dredged material to be used would be the minimum amount necessary to achieve the purpose of the project;

d. beneficial uses and water quality of the Bay would be protected; and

e. there is a high probability that the project would be successful and not result in unmitigated environmental harm;

2. The project includes an adequate monitoring and management plan and has been carefully planned, and the Commission has established measurable performance objectives and controls that would help ensure the success and permanence of the project, and an agency or organization with fish and wildlife management expertise has expressed to the Commission its intention to manage and operate the site for habitat enhancement or restoration purposes for the life of the project;

3. The project would use only clean material suitable for aquatic disposal and the Commission has solicited the advice of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Dredged Material Management Office and other appropriate agencies on the suitability of the dredged material;

4. The project would not result in a net loss of Bay or certain waterway surface area or volume. Any offsetting fill removal would be at or near as feasible to the habitat fill site;

5. Dredged material would not be placed in areas with particularly high or rare existing natural resource values, such as eelgrass beds and tidal marsh and mudflats, unless the material would be needed to protect or enhance the habitat. The habitat project would not, by itself or cumulatively with other projects, significantly decrease the overall amount of any particular habitat within the Suisun, North, South, or Central Bays, excluding areas that have been recently dredged;

6. The Commission has consulted with the California Department of Fish and Game, the National Marine Fisheries Service, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to ensure that at least one of these agencies supports the proposed project; and

7. After a reasonable period of monitoring, if either:

   a. the project has not met its goals and measurable objectives, and attempts at remediation have proven unsuccessful, or

   b. the dredged material is found to have substantial adverse impacts on the natural resources of the Bay, then the dredged material would be removed, unless it is demonstrated by competent environmental studies that removing the material would have a greater adverse effect on the Bay than allowing it to remain, and the site would be returned to the conditions existing immediately preceding placement of the dredged material.

b) To ensure protection of Bay habitats, the Commission should not authorize dredged material disposal projects in the Bay and certain waterways for habitat creation, enhancement or restoration, except for projects using a minor amount of dredged material, until:

1. Objective and scientific studies have been carried out to evaluate the advisability of disposal of dredged material in the Bay and certain waterways for habitat creation, enhancement and restoration. Those additional studies should address the following:
    a. The Baywide need for in-Bay habitat creation, enhancement and restoration, in the context of maintaining appropriate amounts of all habitat types within the Bay, especially for support and recovery of endangered species; and
    b. The need to use dredged materials to improve Bay habitat, the appropriate characteristics of locations in the Bay for such projects, and the potential short-term and cumulative impacts of such projects; and

The Commission has adopted additional Baywide policies governing disposal of dredged material in the Bay and certain waterways for the creation, enhancement and restoration of Bay habitat, which narratively establish the necessary biological, hydrological, physical and locational characteristics of candidate sites; and

2. The Oakland Middle Harbor enhancement project, if undertaken, is completed successfully.

14. Dredging, Policy 12: "The Commission should continue to participate in the LTMS, the Dredged Material Management Office, and other initiatives conducting research on Bay sediment movement, the effects of dredging and disposal on Bay natural resources, alternatives to Bay aquatic disposal, and funding additional costs of transporting dredged materials to non-tidal and ocean disposal sites."

Appendix E: Full Citations for Regional Plans Most Relevant to the Grant Program

As discussed in Appendix C, the Restoration Act states that the Authority will "give priority to projects that, to the greatest extent possible, meet the selection criteria of and are consistent with the State Coastal Conservancy's San Francisco Bay Area Conservancy program (in accordance with subdivision (c) of Section 31163 of the Public Resources Code)." One of these criteria is, "Are supported by adopted local or regional plans." Full citations for the regional plans the Authority considers most relevant to the grant program are provided below.

Restoring the Estuary: An Implementation Strategy for the San Francisco Bay Joint Venture. (2001.) San Francisco Bay Joint Venture. http://www.sonic.net/~sfbayjv/estuarybook.php

*The Baylands and Climate Change: What We Can Do. Baylands Ecosystem Habitat Goals Science Update 2015. (*2015.) California State Coastal Conservancy. http://baylandsgoals.org/science-update-2016/

Recovery Plan for Tidal Marsh Ecosystems for Northern and Central California. (2013.) U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. https://www.fws.gov/sacramento/ES/Recovery-Planning/Tidal-Marsh/Documents/TMRP_Volume1_RP.pdf

San Francisco Bay Subtidal Habitat Goals Report: Conservation Planning for the Submerged Areas of the Bay. (2010.) California State Coastal Conservancy, Ocean Protection Council, NOAA National Marine Fisheries Service and Restoration Center, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, San Francisco Estuary Partnership. http://www.sfbaysubtidal.org/report.html

Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan for the San Francisco Estuary. (2016.) San Francisco Estuary Partnership. http://www.sfestuary.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/CCMPFinalOct2016.pdf

Surviving the Storm. (2015.) Bay Area Council Economic Institute. http://documents.bayareacouncil.org/survivingthestorm.pdf

San Francisco Bay Trail Plan: A Recreational Ring Around San Francisco Bay. (1989.) Association of Bay Area Governments. http://baytrail.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/San-Francisco-Bay-Trail_-Bay-Trail-Plan-Summary.pdf

San Francisco Bay Trail Design Guidelines & Toolkit (2016.) San Francisco Bay Trail. http://baytrail.org/pdfs/BayTrailDGTK_082616_Web.pdf

Enhanced San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail Plan. (2011.) California State Coastal Conservancy. http://scc.ca.gov/webmaster/ftp/pdf/sccbb/2011/1103/20110317Board08_SF_Bay_Area_Water_Trail_Ex3.pdf

Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin (Basin Plan). (2017.) San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board. http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/sanfranciscobay/basin_planning.shtml#basinplan

Long-Term Management Strategy for the Placement of Dredged Material in the San Francisco Bay Region, Management Plan (2001.) U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Environmental Protection

Agency, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.
http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/Portals/68/docs/Dredging/LMTS/entire%20LMTF.pdf