

2015 DROUGHT PSN

APPENDIX B

PROPOSAL EVALUATION and SCORING PROTOCOLS

Administrative Review	1
Cost Analysis Evaluation.....	2
Cost Share Scoring Matrix.....	3
Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review.....	4
Public School Watershed and Fishery Conservation Education (ED)	5
Enforcement and Protection (EF).....	7
Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP), Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB)	9
Instream Habitat Restoration (HI), Instream Bank Stabilization (HS).....	12
Riparian Restoration (HR).....	14
Upslope Restoration (HU)	16
Project Design (PD)	19
Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, Planning and Restoration Project Planning (PL)...	21
Private Sector Technical Training and Education (TE)	23
Water Conservation Measures (WC).....	25
Water Measuring Devices (WD).....	27
California Coastal Salmonid Restoration Grants Peer Review Committee (PRC)	28

Administrative Review

FRGP staff will conduct an administrative review on all hard copy proposals submitted to 830 S Street. The staff administrative review will determine if the proposal package is complete and meets all the requirements for submission in the 2015 Drought PSN. If the proposal does not pass the administrative review, the proposal will not be considered further for funding this year.

	Yes	No
1. Proposal submitted by the 2015 PSN deadline. (All project types.)		
2. Drought 2015 Application Form was used. (All project types.)		
3. Applicant is a public agency, Indian tribe, or certified nonprofit organization. (All project types.)		
4. Submitted 5 paper copies and 1 CD. (All project types.)		
5. Does project meet Focus? (All project types.)	Species	
	Anadromous Waters	
	Project Type	
6. Given the background information and data made available, is the proposed restoration applicable to: (All project types.)		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • restoring drought damaged habitats? ____ • enhancing resilient habitat? ____ • better preparing local communities for future drought impacts on anadromous habitat goals? ____ 		
7. Project Description is sufficiently detailed. (All project types.)		
8. Budget is sufficiently detailed a) without lump sums or b) lump sums detailed on separate budget. (All project types.)		
9. Design Plans included. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HS, HU, WC, WD)		
10. Existing Condition Sketch included. (Project Type: PD)		
11. Project Location Topographic Map included. (Project Types: All project types.)		
12. Watershed (or County) Map included. (Project Types: ED, EF, HU, PD, PL, TE, WD)		
13. Provisional landowner access agreement is a) included and b) signed. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, PD, PL, TE, WC, WD)	a)	
	b)	
14. Water Right Verification included. (Project Types FP, HB, WC, WD)		
15. Photographs of project site are included. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, PD)		
16. a) Fence Maintenance Plan and b) Riparian Restoration Plan are included. (Project Type HR)	a)	
	b)	
17. Evaluation Plan included. (Project Type: ED, EF, TE)		
18. Training Curriculum. (Project Type: ED, EF)		
19. Description of protection issues. (Project Type: EF)		
20. Is the restoration application guided by a CDFW or NMFS recovery plan? If yes: which plan: _____ which task: _____		
21. Is the restoration application incorporating effectiveness monitoring, consistent with CDFW guidance?		
22. Does the applicant identify a water efficiency and conservation plan for the Organization?		
23. The proposed project design/plan is lacking vital information and should not be considered for funding at this time. See comments below.		

Comments:

Cost Analysis Evaluation

Evaluation of project cost analysis will include the following:

- Comparison of wages, equipment rates, material costs, and other project costs for similar completed and proposed project work within similar geographic regions.
- Review of labor costs identified by Department of Industrial Relations General Prevailing Wage Determinations (<http://www.dir.ca.gov/dlse/dlseWagesAndHours.html>), Davis-Bacon labor rates (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/davisbacon/>), and recent California Employment Development Department wage data (<http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/>).
- Review of regional equipment rental cost information (including the most current version of California Department of Transportation's (CalTrans), *Labor Surcharge and Equipment Rental Rates* publication (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/construc/equipmnt.html>)).
- Restoration costs, labor requirements, and production rates identified in Appendix I of the *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon*, DFG 2004
http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fish/documents/SAL_SH/SAL_Coho_Recovery/ReportToCommission_2004/22.I_CostAndSocioeconomicImpacts.pdf

Cost analysis evaluation will consider project logistics (e.g. site remoteness, accessibility, coordination required with multiple land holdings), review of production rates/labor requirements in the regional area, and benefit to the recovery of anadromous salmonids.

Cost Share Scoring Matrix

Proposal#: _____ Project Type: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: __/__/__

Proposal Name: _____

$$\% \text{ Soft Cost Share} = (\text{Soft Cost Share} / \text{Total Project Cost}) \times 100 = \left(\frac{\quad}{\quad} \right) \times 100 =$$

$$\% \text{ Hard Cost Share} = (\text{Hard Cost Share} / \text{Total Project Cost}) \times 100 = \left(\frac{\quad}{\quad} \right) \times 100 =$$

Cost Share

1. Cost share not suitable: projects, personnel, or supplies and equipment previously funded by CDFW; resources expended prior to the term of the grant; salaries of permanently funded employees working for the CDFW or NOAA Fisheries; mitigation funds; cost share funds that will not be confirmed by February 1, 2016.

2. Hard cost share: All hard cost share must be Non-Federal sourced money or in-kind contributions which do not come from a Federal source. Hard cost share can be provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in the implementation of the proposed project confirmed prior to August 30, 2015.

3. Soft cost share: All soft cost share is Federal sourced money or in-kind contributions which come from a Federal source. Soft cost share can be provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in the implementation of the proposed project. The following in-kind contributions can only be counted as soft cost share regardless of funding source: administrative overhead or the components of administrative overhead (as described in Part IV page 30); **and** cost share funds that will be confirmed after August 30, 2015 up until February 1, 2016.

Cost share scoring matrix:

% Soft	% Hard										
	90-99 %	80-89 %	70-79 %	60-69 %	50-59 %	40-49 %	30-39 %	20-29 %	10-19 %	5 - 9 %	0 - 4 %
90-99 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
80-89 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
70-79 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60-69 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-59 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25
40-49 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25	-0.25
30-39 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25	-0.50	-0.50
20-29 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25	-0.50	-0.75	-0.75
10-19 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.25	-0.50	-0.75	-1.0	-1.0
0 - 9 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.50	-0.75	-0.75	-1.0	-1.0

Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review
Fisheries Restoration Grants Program
 Fisheries Engineering Program Staff

Question:	YES	NO	N/A	Comments
1. Given the background information and/or data provided in the proposal, is the project described thoroughly enough, is the approach appropriate to the problem, and does the project approach/design match the stated goals?				
2. Does the Intermediate or Conceptual Plan Report describe the set of conditions, constraints, and requirements necessary for project design and are the plans >65 percent plan development for the following project categories: FP, HB, HS, WD (and some HI and HU)?				
3. Are any refinements that need to be made to the design reasonable to make between the 65% and 100% design? Does the project proponent/designer seem willing to, capable of, and have funds for making the necessary changes?				
4. If the project is likely to require future consultation or evaluation of a conceptual/intermediate plan as it is being developed, is this consultation reflected in the project time line and budget or can it be accomplished within the project timeline/budget?				
5. Does the project team have the experience or compliment of expertise required for project success (e.g., demonstrated experience on similar projects; technical expertise appropriate to the project; communication, coordination and logistical capabilities)?				
6. If the project is likely to require the participation of a licensed engineer or geologist, is the licensed professional identified?				
7. If applicable, has the responsible party signed a letter agreeing to the operation and maintenance responsibilities identified in the PSN for the O&M 1600 for the project after the FRGP grant ends? (applies to SC projects).				
8. From an engineering perspective, should the proposal be considered for funding? Note: If any of the above questions were answered "NO", then the proposal should not be considered for funding at this time. If there are other engineering/feasibility reasons why the proposal should not be funded, state them here.				

Public School Watershed and Fishery Conservation Education (ED)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___ / ___ / ___

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN.

Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontractors). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Instruction is focused on watershed and anadromous fishery conservation.	0			-5
6. If education materials are to be developed – submitted an outline of proposed new materials which includes the correlation with the National Project for Excellence in Environmental Education Guidelines and /or California Department of Education Content Standards.	0			-1
7. Project using established materials and curriculum - identified the material(s) and how it corresponds to current California Department of Education Content Standards and/or National Science Content Standards.	0			-1
8. The project includes an evaluation plan which contains elements	0			-1

specified in the PSN (i.e. specific learning objectives and tools to measure gains of students, teachers, and/or community).				
9. Project materials address conditions of the local watershed and demonstrates support of regional &/or statewide anadromous salmonid habitat restoration and fisheries recovery efforts.	0	-.25	.05	-1
10. Project promotes personal responsibility for watershed stewardship with the overarching goals of students, families, and communities understanding the nature of the salmonid resource and the effects of their own and others actions.	0	-.25	-0.5	1
11. Project demonstrates local area stakeholder support.	0			-0.5
12. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

Enforcement and Protection (EF)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ____/____/____

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontractors). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Actions, instruction and/or training is focused on fish habitat, watershed, and anadromous fishery protection.	0			DNF
6. Project focuses on one or more of the following watershed and anadromous fishery protection issues: 1) monitoring of activities which could cause water pollution, 2) poaching or over fishing, 3) evaluation of water rights issue or, 4) enhancing public education outreach programs which serve to protect anadromous species and their habitat. Yes = Proposal fully addresses issue; Med = addresses most aspects of the issue; Low = addresses some aspects of the issue; DNF = proposal does not sufficiently address the issue.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF

7. Where the training may result in development of directed enforcement and protection, the proposal: Yes = clearly identifies the desired results for anadromous fish species or habitat conditions; Med = has some ambiguity in desired results; Low = provides limited, desired results; No = Provides no desired results.	0	-1	-2	DNF
8. Proposals that train enforcement, legal, or regulatory personnel: Yes = clearly identify and provide a sound verification procedure to assure that project personnel are being used efficiently and are accountable; Med = provide for an adequate level of verification; Low = provide limited verification; DNF = provide no verification and assurance.	0	-0.5	-1.5	DNF
9. The proposal will result in public awareness of watershed and fishery resource protection principals and will continue to serve as a positive reinforcement for protection actions which support watershed and resource stewardship: Yes = clear links to fish or habitat protection; Med = general links; Low = vague links; No = no links.	0	-1	-2	-3
10. Where proposals target or include a public education element to the training, the project 1) promotes personal or community responsibility for watershed stewardship, 2) the protection of salmonid resources and, 3) the effects of personal and others actions: Yes = training element is clear and thorough; Med = element is general but includes all three aspects; Low = element lacks one of the aspects; No = element lacks two or all of the elements.	0	-1	-2	-3
11. Project personnel and procedures comply with current State law enforcement requirements ¹ .	0			DNF
12. Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

¹ CDFW Law Enforcement staff will be assigned to Review Team to evaluate these proposals and will be singly responsible for interpreting this criterion.

Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP), Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___/___/___

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks. Yes = Appropriate level of qualifications, experience, successfully completed previously funded grants (no missing deliverables, no invoicing problems, no missed timelines); Med = lacks some qualifications, experience, one minor documented problem with completing a funded grant; Low = lacks significant qualifications, experience, more than one documented problem with completing a funded grant; No = unqualified, inexperienced, many documented problems with completing funded grants, uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Proposal demonstrates the identified subcontractors have the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks; if subcontractor(s) not identified, the selection criteria are described to insure subcontractors will be appropriate to the work. Yes = appropriate level of qualifications, experience, and/or selection criteria described or no subcontractors needed; Med = lacks some qualifications, experience, one minor documented problem with past work on a funded project, named subcontractors not appropriate for work, and/or selection criteria needs some clarity; Low = lacks significant qualifications, experience, many documented problems with past work on a funded project, and/or selection criteria inadequate; No = unqualified, inexperienced, problematic subcontractors, uncooperative, and selection criteria missing.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
3. Project description includes required details as described in the PSN (Part IV and Part VI,) necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = description includes required information for project type and is clear and comprehensive/complete; Med = description is missing a few elements of the required information and needs some clarity before statement of work can be written; No = description is missing several elements, is general, and/or a list of activities with no detail, lacking the detail necessary to write a statement of work.	0	-1		DNF
4. Project budget is appropriate for the work proposed. Yes = budget is appropriate; Med = budget has 1 line item inappropriate for the work proposed; Low = more than 1 budget line item is inappropriate for the work proposed; No = inappropriate for the work proposed.	0	-0.25	-0.5	DNF

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
5. Project budget is cost effective. Yes = budget is cost effective; Med = 1 or 2 budget items are not cost effective but overall the budget is acceptable; Low = more than 2 budget items are not cost effective but overall the budget is acceptable; No = overall budget is not cost effective.	0	-0.25	-0.5	DNF
6. Project budget is accurate. Yes = budget has no errors; Med = budget has a few minor errors that don't impact writing a grant budget; Low = budget contains inaccuracies making it difficult to write a grant budget; No = many inaccuracies and errors, so that a budget cannot be written.	0	-0.25	-0.5	DNF
7. Project budget is sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget has no unspecified lump sums; Med = budget has 1 unspecified lump sum; Low = budget is lacking detail with more than 1 unspecified lump sum, making it difficult to write a budget; No = budget lacks detail necessary to write a grant budget.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
8. Supplemental information is present and sufficiently detailed, as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is present and sufficiently detailed; Med = 1 piece is missing or insufficiently detailed; Low = 2 pieces of supplemental information are missing or insufficiently detailed; No = more than 2 pieces of supplemental information are missing or insufficiently detailed.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
9. Information supplied allows for a field review to be conducted. Yes = provisional access agreement included and landowner(s) cooperative; No = provisional access agreement missing and/or landowner(s) uncooperative.	0			DNF
10. Based on the DFW/NOAA Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
11. Extent of existing barrier to migrating adult or juvenile anadromous salmonids. Yes = complete barrier to either; Med = partial barrier to either; No = not a barrier to both adults and juveniles or no assessment completed.	0	-0.5		DNF
12. The proposed project meets CDFW and NOAA Fisheries fish passage criteria (see Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX Appendix A and B, and Part XII). Yes = project will provide unimpeded passage for adults and juveniles; Med = improves adult and juvenile passage but does not meet criteria under some high or low flows; Low = project only addresses adult passage where juvenile passage is needed; No = project will not meet fish passage criteria.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
13. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quantity of the habitat upstream of the barrier to the next barrier. Yes = > 1 mile; Med = 1 to 0.5 mile; Low = 0.5 to 0.25 mile; No = < 0.25 (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
14. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality of the habitat upstream of the barrier to the next barrier. Yes = Excellent/Good; Med = Fair; Low = Poor; No = unknown (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX).	0	-0.5	-0.75	-2

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
15. Documented absence of other downstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers. Yes = no barriers downstream; Med = barrier downstream with a plan to identify and treat; Low = partial barrier downstream with no plan to identify or treat; No = Complete barrier downstream with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
16. Documented absence of upstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers. Yes = no barriers upstream; Med = barrier upstream with a plan to identify and treat; No = barrier upstream with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.25		-0.5
17. Field review conducted (Y or N. Informational, therefore no score.) If no then explain.				
18. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

Instream Habitat Restoration (HI), Instream Bank Stabilization (HS)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___ / ___ / ___

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN.
Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	- 0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
6. Instream limiting factors have been identified within the watershed: (Such as Spawning, Over-winter habitat, Summer Rearing, Escape Cover, Passage, etc) as a priority based in: Yes = complete watershed assessment; Med = habitat inventory report or equivalent; Low = reach level survey; No = no plan/survey.	0	-0.25	-1	-2
7. Extent to which proposed project corrects the problem being addressed. Yes = completely; Med = partially; No = does not.	0	-0.5		-5
8. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
9. The problems have been adequately identified and the techniques proposed are appropriate for the channel type (according to Part III). Yes = all; or No = none.	0			-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
10. The project will utilize CDFW acceptable techniques as described in the manual or approved by CDFW/NOAA engineers. Yes = described in manual, Med = not in manual but approved by CDFW/NOAA engineers, No = not in manual or approved by engineers.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
11. Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type, and species for the stream zone (active channel and floodplain) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
12. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

Riparian Restoration (HR)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___/___/___

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN.

Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	- 0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
6. Is riparian restoration plan adequate to implement project.	0			-5
7. Riparian limiting factors, have been identified within the watershed (Canopy, Riparian Stability, Escape Cover, Complexity, etc) as a priority based in: Yes = complete watershed assessment; Med = habitat inventory report or equivalent; Low = reach level survey; No = no plan/survey.	0	-0.25	-1	-2
8. Extent to which proposed project implements priority riparian recommendations from the plan to restore natural function of the riparian corridor for the entire identified reach/sub-watershed: Yes = > 75%; Med = 74-50%; Low 25-49% partial; No < 25%.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
Field Level Review – Technique, location, application				

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
9. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-5
10. The project will utilize CDFW acceptable techniques as described in the manual (Part VII and XI).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
11. The plants will be monitored and replanted (if necessary) to achieve the specified standard for success: Yes = 3 years or more; Med = 2 years; Low = 1 year; No = not monitored.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
12. Where necessary to achieve specified standard for success the plants will be maintained including irrigation, weeding, and herbivore protection: Yes = Not necessary to achieve specified standard for success or maintained for 3 years; Med = Maintained for 2 years; Low = Maintained for 1 year; No = Not maintained but maintenance necessary to achieve specified standard for success.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
13. Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type and appropriate successional species for the stream zone (active channel and floodplain) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
14. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

Upslope Restoration (HU)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / ____

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks. Yes = Appropriate level of qualifications, experience, successfully completed previously funded grants (no missing deliverables, no invoicing problems, no missed timelines); Med = lacks some qualifications, experience, one documented problem with completing a funded grant; Low = lacks a lot of qualifications, experience, more than one documented problem with completing a funded grant; No = unqualified, inexperienced, many documented problems with completing funded grants, uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Proposal demonstrates the identified subcontractors have the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks; if subcontractor(s) not identified, the selection criteria are described to insure subcontractors will be appropriate to the work. Yes = appropriate level of qualifications, experience, and/or selection criteria described or no subcontractors needed; Med = lacks some qualifications, experience, one documented problem with past work on a funded project, named subcontractors not appropriate for work, and/or selection criteria needs some clarity; Low = lacks a lot of qualifications, experience, many documented problems with past work on a funded project, and/or selection criteria inadequate; No = unqualified, inexperienced, problematic subcontractors, uncooperative, and selection criteria missing.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
3. Project description includes required details as described in the PSN (Part IV & VI) necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = description includes required information for project type and is clear and comprehensive/complete; Med = description is missing a few elements of the required information and needs some clarity before statement of work can be written; No = description is missing several elements, is general, and/or a list of activities with no detail, lacking the detail necessary to write a statement of work.	0	-1		DNF
4. Project budget is appropriate for the work proposed. Yes = budget is appropriate; Med = budget has 1 line item inappropriate for the work proposed; Low = more than 1 budget line item is inappropriate for the work proposed; No = inappropriate for the work proposed.	0	-0.25	-0.5	DNF
5. Project budget is cost effective. Yes = budget is cost effective; Med = 1 or 2 budget items are not cost effective but overall the budget is acceptable; Low = more than 2 budget items are not cost effective making the budget unacceptable; No = budget is not cost effective.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
6. Project budget is accurate. Yes = budget has no errors; Med = budget has only minor errors, such that a grant budget can be easily written; Low = budget contains inaccuracies making it difficult to write a grant budget; No = many inaccuracies and errors, so that a budget cannot be written.	0	-0.25	-1	DNF
7. Project budget is sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget has no unspecified lump sums; Med = budget has 1 unspecified lump sum; Low = budget is lacking detail with more than 1 unspecified lump sum, making it difficult to write a budget; No = budget lacks detail necessary to write a grant budget.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
8. Supplemental information is present and sufficiently detailed, as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is present and sufficiently detailed; Med = 1 piece is missing or insufficiently detailed; Low = 2 pieces of supplemental information are missing or insufficiently detailed; No = more than 2 pieces of supplemental information are missing or insufficiently detailed.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
9. Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
10. Proposed road treatments will reduce sediment delivery to salmonid bearing streams. Yes = permanent de-commissioning (abandonment as described in the Manual, Chapter X, page 103) or road-to-trail conversion for foot traffic only; Med = at least 25% of all sites proposed are for permanent de-commissioning and/or road-to-trail conversion for foot traffic, and storm-proofing for the remaining sites; Low = <25% of all sites proposed are for permanent de-commissioning or road-to-trail conversion for foot traffic, and storm-proofing for the remaining sites; No = treatments will not reduce sediment delivery.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
11. Salmonid limiting factors associated with sediment delivery (e.g. excessive sediment, spawning gravel quality, etc.) have been identified as a priority within the watershed based on: Yes = a completed watershed plan; Med = a habitat inventory assessment or equivalent, identifying limiting factors for salmonids; Low = a Conceptual Plan (road log); No = no plan, assessment, or road log.	0	-0.25	-1	-5
12. The treatment locations are: Yes = at least 75% of treatments are on riparian roads; Med = at least 50% of treatments are on riparian roads; Low = at least 25% of treatments are on riparian roads; No = less than 25% of treatments are on riparian roads.	0	-1	-2	-3
13. Volume of sediment savings proposed to a focal species stream. . Yes = <u>at least 75%</u> of sediment saved is prevented from directly entering a focal species stream; Medium = <u>at least 50%</u> of sediment saved is prevented from directly entering focal species stream; Low = <u>at least 25%</u> of sediment saved is prevented from directly entering a focal species stream; No = less than 25% of sediment saved is prevented from directly entering a focal species stream.	0	-1	-2	-3
14. Extent to which the proposed project implements the high and medium priority upslope restoration recommendations from the assessment to reduce sediment delivery to the stream for the identified reach/sub-watershed. Yes = $\geq 75\%$ total number of treatments recommended are high and medium priority; No = $<75\%$ total number of treatments recommended are high and medium priority.	0			-2

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
15. If competent LWD (e.g. redwood, Douglas fir or locally appropriate wood, greater than 12 inches in diameter and 16 feet long) is generated by the project, it is being used at another identified restoration site or will be staged at an accessible location for future restoration projects. Yes = restoration site identified, will be staged at an accessible location, or not applicable; No = if wood is generated it is not being used for current or future projects.	0			-0.5
16. If applicable, the instream habitat (LWD) portion of the project has been adequately identified and the techniques proposed are appropriate for the channel type (according to Part III). Yes = adequately identified and appropriate techniques or not applicable; Low = inadequately identified; No = inappropriate techniques.	0		-2	DNF
17. The project will meet the criteria for treatments proposed as described in the Manual, Chapter X or accepted by CDFW/NOAA engineers. Yes = meets manual criteria for treatments proposed; Med = does not meet Manual criteria, but accepted by CDFW/NOAA engineers; No = does not meet Manual criteria or is not accepted by engineers.	0	-1		DNF
18. The treatments proposed use material of the size and type that are appropriate for the watershed/sub watershed/land management area (according to the Manual, Chapter X). Yes = all; No = none.	0			-5
19. Field review conducted (Y or N. Informational, therefore no score.)If field review not conducted explain.				
20. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

Project Design (PD)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___ / ___ / ___

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
6. The proposed project would improve, protect, or enhance habitat for anadromous salmonids? Yes = addresses a Key limiting factor, Low = addresses a contributing factor, No = does not address any factors.	0		-2	-5
7. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
8. Licensed professional(s) has the expertise as appropriate to the type of project being designed.	0			-5
9. The proposal identifies all necessary surveys required to complete the design. Yes = identifies all surveys, Low = does not identify 1 or 2 surveys, No = does not identify any surveys.	0		-2	-3

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
10. Degree to which proposed project will develop implementation project(s); Yes = Implementation directly after this project (Final Plan), Med = Proposal is a feasibility study, No = not a feasibility study and design produced is less than Final Plan (100%)	0	-1		-5
11.				
12. The proposed deliverables include plans and maps, and will effectively convey limiting factors and prioritized solutions to landowners and other interested people.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
13. Proposal documents sufficient local landowner support for project implementation after project design is completed. Yes = Landowner support is documented by landowner access or a description is adequate to ensure landowner interest, Med = a few landowners have not been contacted, Low = landowner support is questionable, No = applicant has not demonstrated contact with landowners or has not described how landowner support will be achieved.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
14. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, Planning and Restoration Project Planning (PL)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___/___/___

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
6. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
7. Project will utilize CDFW acceptable assessment protocols.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
8. If there are significant social issues associated with successful restoration of the watershed, the proposal adequately addresses those issues, or references a prior document adequately addressing those issues.	0			-5
9. Extent to which proposed project encompasses or completes an entire watershed or sub-watershed; Yes = 80-100% of the watershed; Med = 70-80% of the watershed; Low = 60-70% of the watershed; No = <50% of the watershed.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
10. Extent to which project will develop complete watershed plan: Yes = Complete watershed plan or NA; Med = Specific assessment based on CDFW-acceptable watershed plan; Low = CDFW-acceptable ranch implementation plan; No = Specific assessment not based on previous planning effort.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
11. The proposed deliverables include plans, reports, maps, and outreach efforts and will effectively convey limiting factors and prioritized solutions to landowners and other interested people.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
12. Proposal documents sufficient local landowner interest for plan implementation or a detailed description of how landowner support will be secured. Yes = Landowner support is documented by landowner access or a description is adequate to ensure landowner interest, Med = a few landowners have not been contacted, Low = landowner support is questionable, No = applicant has not demonstrated contact with landowners or has not described how landowner support will be achieved.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
13. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Private Sector Technical Training and Education (TE)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___ / ___ / ___

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review: Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding or NA; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
6. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
7. Project provides private sector training and education in the field of anadromous salmonid habitat analysis and restoration; or teaches private landowners about practical means of improving land and water management practices that, if implemented will contribute to protections and restoration of salmon and steelhead habitat; or offers scholarship funding for attending workshops or conferences that teach restoration techniques; or operate nonprofit restoration technical school; or produces restoration training and education workshop or conference.	0			-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
8. Project provides training or technical education focusing on one or more of the following watershed and anadromous fishery conservation issues: fish passage improvement projects; conservation easement and other incentive programs; protecting and improving water quality and quantity; education needed to further regional/county efforts; development of a scientific framework for future funding years; educational demonstration projects; engineering design work, road surfacing and associated activities; research that advances the science of anadromous fish recovery and results in recommendations; monitoring; permanent easement or fee title to riparian buffer strips along coastal rivers and streams that results in the protection of key salmon and steelhead refugia; upslope projects (i.e. erosion prevention and control projects, remediation); protection of key and refugia watersheds; protection and restoration of riparian corridors; assessment projects that will result in prescriptions; TMDL implementation plans (e.g. ranch plans); instream habitat restoration projects; restoration focused artificial propagation.	0			-5
9. Project is a collaboration involving non-profit, for-profit, or public entities.	0			-0.5
10. Includes an evaluation plan, including pre-and post-testing and pre-and post-attendee surveys, performance standards, or an assessment rubric.	0			-5
11. Project addresses needs of the local watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
12. Project promotes personal responsibility for watershed stewardship with the goal of having landowners, resource professionals, restorationists, and communities better understand the salmonid resource and the effect of their own and others actions.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
13. Project directly supports local salmonid habitat restoration and recovery efforts.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
14. Project demonstrates local area stakeholder support.	0			-1
15. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

Water Conservation Measures (WC)

Proposal #: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___/___/___

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
6. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
7. Included is a copy of the fee title appropriated or adjudicated water ownership title, deed, or other document that demonstrates the validity of ownership for the water rights being proposed or modified.	0			-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
8. If the project will utilize Chapter 10, Section 1707 of the California Water Code to dedicate the water conserved does the proposal describe how the 1707 dedication process will be accomplished as part of this project, including the data needed to apply for and successfully complete the transaction with the SWRCB (and the court if the dedicated water right has been adjudicated), how these data will be developed, the time line estimated for the dedication process, and planned for a consultation/coordination meeting with the SWRCB, and the CDFW Water Rights Coordinator in the region where the dedication will occur?	0			DNF
9. <u>For water conservation projects that utilize forbearance agreements or instream flow leases:</u> does the proposal describe the local organization that will be responsible for developing the agreement and/or lease, and its experience and organizational capacity to develop such agreements and to coordinate post-project water monitoring and water use in the watershed.	0			DNF
10. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality and quantity of the habitat. Yes = Good; Med = Fair; Low = Poor; No = unknown.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
11. Reduced water quality or quantity from water extraction or tailwater documented by, and determined to be, degrading to salmonid habitat by a qualified biologist/hydrologist.	0			-2
12. Water saved or returned to the stream from the project will be available during the times of year when it will provide the greatest benefit to salmonid habitat. Yes = provides greatest benefit to salmonids, Med = provides some benefit to salmonids, No = provides no benefit to salmonids.	0	-1		-2
13. Water losses and potential savings realized through project implementation, identified by a qualified hydrologist.	0			-2
14. Project or diversion will be implemented and operated using BMP's approved by CDFW and/or NOAA Fisheries and in compliance with water rights regulations.	0			-2
15. Project will reduce tailwater generation through improved irrigation systems or assist in recovery and reuse of tailwater, to prevent discharge of tailwater to stream. (Not applicable = Yes.)	0			-2
16. Tailwater system protected from storm/high water events.	0			-1
17. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

Water Measuring Devices (WD)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ____ / ____ / ____

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including sub-contracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, accurate, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, a few inaccuracies, and 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, many inaccuracies, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Based on the DFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
6. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
7. Reduced water quality and/or quantity from water extraction documented by a qualified hydrologist and determined to be degrading to salmonid habitat by a qualified biologist, or the intent of the water measuring device is to help manage water diversions in order to avoid or minimize impacts to fisheries.	0			-5
8. Instream gauges positioned to track mainstem flow as well as tributaries that contribute flow for fish recovery.	0			-1
9. Gauge installed in support of salmonid recovery actions.	0			-5
10. Will the gauge be operated and maintained past the expiration of this proposal?	0			-1
11. Level of cost share (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

California Coastal Salmonid Restoration Grants Peer Review Committee (PRC)

Proposal#: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___ / ___ / ___

Proposal Name: _____

PRC Review

The PRC evaluates and scores each proposal based on the following criteria. Each criterion below is worth a maximum of one point. Points are added to achieve a final score. Maximum final score is 5, lowest score is 0.

Criteria	Maximum score of 1 point (fractions allowed)
<p>1. Benefit to Species. The proposal addresses a recovery or restoration need documented for the target species, age-class, and location (site, reach, watershed, and/or population) and the beneficial response of fish will be maintained over a reasonable if not permanent duration.</p>	
<p>2. Technical Merit. The write-up is sufficient for reviewers to fully understand and evaluate the technical merits of the project (project plans, designs with specific sites, activities identified). Objectives, approach, and scope of work are clear and technically sound; the project both feasible and appropriate for the site and can be completed on schedule given reasonably foreseeable constraints (weather conditions, planting seasons, operational conditions).</p>	
<p>3. Cost Effectiveness. The budget details identify unit costs, hourly rates, and line items, indirect charges do not exceed 20% percent, and the project is cost effective (total cost, market rate). The proposal identifies cost share source(s) (federal, state, other), type (cash, in-kind), the status of the cost share (secured, pending [if pending, the date a decision is expected to be made]), and the dollar amount/percent share of total cost.</p>	
<p>4. Community and Partner Involvement. There is demonstrated local area stakeholder support for the project (number, diversity of partners, contact information/letters demonstrating involvement). The project will be coordinated with local agencies and stakeholders.</p>	
<p>5. Organization Qualifications. The project manager, principal investigator(s), and other key personnel have experience and expertise required for the project, and individual roles and responsibilities are well defined and appropriate. The proposal demonstrates relevant field experience, completed projects, published reports, or other materials. When necessary, licensed professionals are identified for design, construction, or oversight of on-the-ground activities. Subcontractor selection and roles are clearly explained and justified.</p>	
<p>Total Score</p>	

Comments: