

2016 FHR PSN

APPENDIX D

PROPOSAL EVALUATION and SCORING PROTOCOLS

Administrative Review	1
Cost Analysis Evaluation.....	2
Cost Share Scoring Matrix.....	3
CDFW and NMFS Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review	4
Program Criteria Review	5
Biological Review Enforcement and Protection (EF)	7
Biological Review Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP) and Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB)	9
Biological Review Instream Habitat Restoration (HI)	11
Biological Review Riparian Restoration (HR)	13
Biological Review Instream Bank Stabilization (HS)	15
Biological Review Upslope Restoration (HU).....	17
Biological Review Monitoring Status and Trends (MD).....	19
Biological Review Monitoring Watershed Restoration (MO)	22
Biological Review Organizational Support (OR).....	24
Biological Review Project Design (PD).....	26
Biological Review Public Involvement (PI).....	28
Biological Review Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, Planning, and Restoration Project Planning (PL)	31
Biological Review Cooperative Rearing (RE).....	34
Biological Review Fish Screens (SC).....	36
Biological Review Private Sector Technical Training and Education (TE).....	38
Biological Review Water Conservation Measures (WC).....	41
Biological Review Water Measuring Devices (WD).....	44
FRGP Peer Review Committee (PRC).....	45

Administrative Review

FRGP staff will conduct an administrative review on all proposals. The staff administrative review will determine if the proposal package is complete and meets all the requirements for submission in the 2016 PSN. If the proposal does not pass the administrative review, the proposal will not be considered further for funding this year. If “No” is answered to any one item below, then the proposal will be considered incomplete, therefore it does not meet submission requirements.

	Yes	No
1. Proposed project is within the 2016 PSN focus.		
2. Design Plans (Intermediate or Conceptual) included. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HS, HU, SC, WC, WD)		
3. Project Location Topographic Map included. (Project Types: All project types except , OR, PI, TE)		
4. Watershed (or County) Map included. (Project Types: EF, HU, MD, MO, OR, PD, PI, PL, RE, TE, WD)		
5. Provisional landowner access agreement is a) included and b) signed. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, MD, MO, PD, PL, RE, SC, TE, WC, WD)	a)	
	b)	
6. Water Law Compliance documents included. (Project Types: FP, HB, PD, SC, WC, WD)		
7. Photographs included. (Project Types: EF, FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, PD, RE, SC, WC, WD)		
8. Status Report included. (Project Types: OR, PI)		
9. Fence Maintenance Plan included. (Project Type: HR)		
10. Riparian Restoration Plan included. (Project Type: HR)		
11. Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QA/QC) Plan included. (Project Types: MD, MO)		
12. Existing Conditions Sketch included. (Project Type: PD)		
13. Reference Documents included. (Project Type: MD, MO, PL)		
14. Five-year Management Plan included. (Project Type: RE)		
15. Evaluation Plan included. (Project Types: EF, TE)		
16. Invasive Species Prevention Protocols included. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, MD, MO, RE, SC, WC, WD)		
17. Water Conservation and Efficiency Program included. (All Project Types)		

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: _____

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

$$\left(\frac{\text{_____}}{\text{_____}} \right) \times 100 =$$

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

$$\left(\frac{\text{_____}}{\text{_____}} \right) \times 100 =$$

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, 2017.
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 15, 2016.
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); **and** cost share funds that will be confirmed after August 15, 2016 up until February 1, 2017.

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

CDFW and NMFS Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review

Proposal #: _____ Project Title: _____

CDFW or NMFS Review Engineer/Geologist: _____

Question:	YES	NO	N/A	Comments
1. Are the problems to be addressed correctly identified and adequately characterized?				
2. Does the design approach, including the O&M, address the identified problems?				
3. Are the techniques proposed appropriate for the channel type (according to the Manual, Part III)?				
4. Does the proposal identify all necessary surveys required to complete the design?				
5. 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)?				
6. 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 before the project is executed (if funded)?				
7. 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?				
8. 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)?				
9. If the project is likely to require the participation of a licensed engineer or geologist, is the licensed professional identified?				
10. 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.				

Program Criteria Review

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

		Mark one			
		Yes	Med	Low	No
1	The proposal <u>as written</u> addresses the identified Recovery Task and can accomplish the Task in part or in whole.	0			DNF
2	Proposal demonstrates the project applicant/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
3	Proposal demonstrates the identified subcontractor(s) have the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks; if subcontractor(s) not identified, the selection criteria are described to ensure 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, 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, uncooperative, named subcontractors not appropriate for work proposed and selection criteria missing.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
4	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 details described in the PSN to write a statement of work; Med = description is missing a few required details described in the PSN and needs some clarity before statement of work can be written; No = description is missing several details, is general, and/or a list of activities with no detail, lacking the detail necessary to write a statement of work.	0	-1		DNF

		Mark one			
		Yes	Med	Low	No
5	Project budget is <u>appropriate</u> 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
6	Project budget is <u>cost effective</u> . 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
7	Project budget is <u>detailed</u> in describing project costs. Yes = budget has no unspecified lump sums; Med = budget has 1 unspecified lump sum without supplemental detail or budget justification; Low = budget is lacking detail with more than 1 unspecified lump sum without supplemental detail or budget justification, making it difficult to write a budget; No = budget has multiple lump sums lacking detail necessary to write a grant budget.	0	-0.25	-0.5	DNF
8	Information supplied allows for a field review to be conducted. Yes = landowner(s) cooperative and site visit possible; No = landowner(s) uncooperative, site visit not possible.	0			DNF
9	Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Biological Review Enforcement and Protection (EF)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

		Mark one			
		Yes	Med	Low	No
1	Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Evaluation Plan do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2	Actions, instruction and/or training are focused on focus species habitat, watershed, and focus species protection. Yes = focus on focus species habitat, watershed, and focus species protection; No = focus is not on focus species habitat, watershed, and focus species protection.	0			DNF
3	The proposed project targets one or more of the following watershed and focus species 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 focus species and their habitat. Yes = at least one focus species protection issue is addressed in detail; Med = most aspects of identified focus species protection issue are addressed; Low = some aspects of identified focus species protection issue are addressed; No = identified focus species protection issue is not addressed.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
4	If the proposed training may result in development of directed enforcement and protection, the proposal clearly identified the desired results for focus species or habitat. Yes = clearly identifies the desired results for focus species or habitat; Med = has some ambiguity in desired results for focus species or habitat; Low = provides limited, desired results for focus species or habitat; No = Provides no desired results for focus species or habitat.	0	-1	-2	DNF

		Mark one			
		Yes	Med	Low	No
5	If the proposed project trains enforcement, legal, or regulatory personnel, the proposal provides a sound verification procedure to ensure project personnel are being used efficiently and are accountable. Yes = provides sound verification procedure to ensure personnel are used efficiently and are accountable; Med = provides an acceptable level of verification assuring project personnel are used efficiently and are accountable ; Low = provides limited verification ensuring project personnel are used efficiently and are accountable; No = provides no verification personnel are used efficiently and are accountable.	0	-0.5	-1.5	DNF
6	The proposed project will result in public awareness of watershed and fishery resource protection principles, and will continue to serve as a positive reinforcement for protection actions supporting focus species or habitat protection. Yes = clear links to protection actions for focus species or habitat protection; Med = general links to protection actions for focus species or habitat protection; Low = vague links to protection actions for focus species or habitat protection; No = no links to protection actions for focus species or habitat protection.	0	-1	-2	-3
7	If the proposed project targets or includes a public education element to the training, the training will include a) enhancing protection of individual focus species fish or populations by providing enhanced ability to prevent illegal take, b) protection of focus species habitat by enhancing ability of responsible parties to prevent pollution and habitat degradation, and c) prevention of illegal destruction of focus species habitat. Yes = all three training elements are included; Med = one training element is missing; No = more than one training element is missing.	0	-1		-3
8	Project personnel and procedures comply with current State law enforcement requirements. Yes = personnel and procedures comply with State law enforcement requirements; No = personnel or procedures do not comply with State law enforcement requirements.	0			DNF

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP) and Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1 Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Intermediate or Conceptual Plan or Water Law Compliance Documents do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2 Based on the CDFW/NOAA Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; No = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
3 Assessment has identified the existing structure as a barrier to migrating focus species adults or juveniles. Yes = complete barrier to either adults or juveniles; Med = partial barrier to either adults or juveniles; No = not a barrier to focus species adults and juveniles or no assessment completed.	0	-0.5		DNF
4 The proposed project meets CDFW and NOAA Fisheries focus species passage criteria (see Habitat Restoration Manual, Part IX, Appendix A and B; and Part XII). Yes = criteria is met and 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 = criteria is only met for adult passage where juvenile passage is needed; No = project will not meet fish passage criteria for either adults or juveniles.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
5 A survey on the target stream substantiates the quantity of the habitat upstream of the barrier to the next barrier. Yes = greater than 1 mile; Med = 1 to 0.5 mile; Low = 0.5 to 0.25 mile; No = less than 0.25 (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
6 A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality of the habitat upstream of the barrier to the next barrier. Yes = Excellent or Good habitat upstream to the next barrier; Med = Fair habitat upstream to the next barrier; Low = Poor habitat upstream to the next barrier; No = unknown habitat upstream to the next barrier (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX).	0	-0.5	-0.75	-2

		Mark one			
		Yes	Med	Low	No
7	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
8	Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Instream Habitat Restoration (HI)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Intermediate or Conceptual Plan do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Based on the CDFW/NOAA Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding or not applicable; DNF = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
3. The proposed project would improve, protect, or enhance focus species habitat, which has been identified as a key limiting factor. Yes = project would improve, protect, or enhance habitat identified as a key limiting factor; Low = project would improve, protect, or enhance habitat identified as a contributing factor; No = project does not improve, protect or enhance any identified limiting or contributing factors.	0		-2	-5
4. The proposed project would achieve the target habitat quantity (metric) throughout the project reach after project completion. Yes = the project would meet the target habitat metric throughout the project reach; Med = the project would achieve 90% or more of the minimum target habitat metric throughout the project reach; Low = the project would achieve 80% or more of the minimum target habitat metric throughout the project reach; No = the project would achieve 50% or less of the target habitat metric throughout the project reach.	0	-1	-2	-3
5. Instream limiting factors have been identified as a priority in the watershed: (Such as Spawning, Over-winter habitat, Summer Rearing, Escape Cover, Passage, etc.) as a priority based on a planning or assessment effort: Yes = complete watershed assessment; Med = habitat inventory report or equivalent; Low = reach level survey; No = no plan or survey.	0	-0.25	-1	-2

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
6. In the project reach, the project as proposed will implement the most effective instream habitat restoration so that no re-treatment will be needed for 10 years. Yes = the project will utilize the most effective instream habitat restoration so that additional restoration will not be needed for 10 years or more; Med = the project will not utilize the most effective restoration but will have some benefit, which may result in additional instream habitat restoration within less than 10 years; No = the project will not utilize the most effective restoration, having little or no benefit and necessitating additional instream habitat restoration within 5 years.	0	-0.5		DNF
7. Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type, and species for the stream zone (active channel and floodplain) and watershed. Yes = materials utilized are appropriate size, type, or species; Med = materials utilized are acceptable but not of optimal size, type, or species; No = materials utilized are not appropriate size, type, or species.	0	-0.5		DNF
8. Project restores or improves geomorphic function and ecological complexity in focus species habitat. Yes = Project improves focus species habitat by improving geomorphic function and ecological complexity; Med = Project maintains geomorphic function and ecological complexity; No = Project reduces focus species habitat, or impairs geomorphic function or ecological complexity.	0	-2		DNF
9. Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Riparian Restoration (HR)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Fence Maintenance Plan or, Riparian Restoration Plan do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Based on the CDFW/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
3. The proposed project would improve, protect, or enhance focus species habitat, which has been identified as a key limiting factor. Yes = project would improve, protect or enhance habitat identified as a key limiting factor; Low = project would improve, protect, or enhance habitat identified as a contributing factor; No = project does not improve, protect or enhance any identified limiting or contributing factors.	0		-2	-5
4. Focus species limiting factors associated with riparian dysfunction have been identified as a priority in the watershed based on a planning or assessment effort. Yes = a completed watershed plan; Med = a habitat inventory assessment or equivalent, identifying limiting factors for salmonids; Low = a Conceptual Plan (streambank inventory); No = no plan, assessment, or road log.	0	-0.25	-1	-5
5. The proposed project implements priority riparian recommendations from the watershed plan, assessment, or conceptual plan to restore riparian function for the entire identified project reach. Yes = implement at least 75% of the priority riparian recommendations in the project reach; Med = implement 74-50% of the priority riparian recommendations in the project reach; Low = implement 25-49% of the priority riparian recommendations in the project reach; No = implement less than 25% of the priority riparian recommendations in the project reach.	0	-0.5	-1	-2

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
6. The project will utilize CDFW acceptable techniques as described in the Manual. Yes = described in manual; No = not described in Manual.	0			DNF
7. The plants will be monitored and replanted (if necessary) to achieve the specified standard for success. Yes = plants will be monitored and replanted for 3 years or more; Med = plants will be monitored and replanted for 2 years; Low = plants will be monitored and replanted for 1 year; No = plants will not be monitored or replanted.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
8. Where necessary to achieve specified standard for success, the plants will be maintained including irrigation, weeding, or herbivore protection. Yes = irrigation, weeding or herbivore protection maintained for 3 years or irrigation, weeding or herbivore not necessary to achieve specified standard for success; Med = irrigation, weeding, or herbivore protection maintained for 2 years; Low = irrigation, weeding, and herbivore protection maintained for 1 year; No = irrigation, weeding, and herbivore protection not maintained, even though irrigation, weeding, and herbivore protection is necessary to achieve specified standard for success.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
9. Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type, and species for the stream zone (active channel and floodplain) and watershed. Yes = materials utilized are appropriate size, type, or species; Med = materials utilized are acceptable but not of optimal size, type, or species; No = materials utilized are not appropriate size, type, or species.	0	-0.5		DNF
10. Project implementation is consistent with maximum efficiency in the project term. Yes = project implementation in the entire project reach will occur within the first season, with project maintenance and monitoring in subsequent years; Med = only partial project implementation (e.g. only permitting first year) in the project reach will occur in the first season; No = no project implementation (including permitting) will occur in the project reach in the first season.	0	-0.5		DNF
11. Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Instream Bank Stabilization (HS)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Intermediate or Conceptual Plan do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Based on the CDFW/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
3. The proposed project would improve, protect, or enhance focus species habitat, which has been identified as a key limiting factor. Yes = project would improve, protect or enhance habitat identified as a key limiting factor; Low = project would improve, protect, or enhance habitat identified as a contributing factor; No = project does not improve, protect or enhance any identified limiting or contributing factors.	0		-2	-5
4. 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 a planning or assessment effort. Yes = a completed watershed plan; Med = a habitat inventory assessment or equivalent, identifying limiting factors for salmonids; Low = a Conceptual Plan (streambank inventory); No = no plan, assessment, or road log.	0	-0.25	-1	-5
5. Impacts from the unstable bank on focus species have been described in detail and documented (refer to PSN). Yes = impacts from the unstable bank on focus species have been described in detail and documented; Med = impacts from the unstable bank on focus species have been partially described and documented; No = impacts from the unstable bank on focus species have not been described and documented.	0	-1		DNF

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
6. Project restores or improves geomorphic evolution, ecological complexity, and riparian function. Yes = Project restores fish habitat by re-establishing geomorphic evolution, ecological complexity, and riparian function; Med = Project improves fish habitat by improving geomorphic evolution, ecological complexity, and riparian function; Low = Project maintains geomorphic function, ecological complexity, and riparian function; No = Project reduces fish habitat or impairs geomorphic function, ecological complexity, or riparian function.	0	-0.5	-2	DNF
7. Current land use practices have been described and will be modified to prevent future bank destabilization or to allow natural stream processes to occur. Yes = land use practices are described and will be modified, or not applicable; Low = land use practices are described, and will not be modified within the limitation of structures present; No= practices are not described or will not be modified.	0		-2	DNF
8. Sediment delivery from the bank destabilization area adversely impacts existing spawning and rearing habitat within the project reach. Yes = sediment delivery adversely impacts existing spawning and rearing habitat within the project reach; No = sediment delivery does not adversely impact existing spawning and rearing habitat within the project reach.	0			DNF
9. Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type, and species for the stream zone (active channel and floodplain) and watershed. Yes = materials utilized are appropriate size, type, or species; Med = materials utilized are acceptable but not of optimal size, type, or species; No = materials utilized are not appropriate size, type, or species.	0	-0.5		DNF
10. Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Upslope Restoration (HU)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or Road Log do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Based on the CDFW/NMFS Engineering and Geo Technical Level Review, the proposal should be considered for funding. Yes = should be considered for funding; No = should not be considered for funding.	0			DNF
3. Focus salmonid species limiting factors associated with sediment delivery (e.g. excessive sediment, spawning gravel quality, etc.) have been identified as a priority in the watershed based on a planning or assessment effort. 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
4. Proposed road treatments will reduce sediment delivery to focus species 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 = less than 25% of all sites proposed are for permanent decommissioning 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
5. The treatment locations are on riparian roads. Yes = <u>at least</u> 75% of treatments are on riparian roads; Med = <u>at least</u> 50% of treatments are on riparian roads; Low = <u>at least</u> 25% of treatments are on riparian roads; No = less than 25% of treatments are on riparian roads.	0	-1	-2	-3

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
6. All the sediment savings proposed is prevented from directly entering a focus species stream. Yes = <u>at least 75%</u> of sediment saved is prevented from directly entering a focus species stream; Medium = <u>at least 50%</u> of sediment saved is prevented from directly entering focus species stream; Low = <u>at least 25%</u> of sediment saved is prevented from directly entering a focus species stream; No = less than 25% of sediment saved is prevented from directly entering a focus species stream.	0	-1	-2	-3
7. 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 = 75% or more total number of treatments recommended are high and medium priority; No = less than 75% total number of treatments recommended are high and medium priority.	0			-2
8. If LWD (i.e. 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
9. If applicable, the instream habitat (LWD) portion of the project has been identified and the techniques proposed are appropriate for the channel type (according to the Manual Part III). Yes = identified and appropriate techniques, or not applicable; Low = generally identified; No = inappropriate techniques.	0		-2	DNF
10. The proposed project will meet the criteria for treatments proposed as described in the Manual, Chapter X or accepted by CDFW/NOAA engineers. Yes = project would meet Manual criteria for proposed treatments; Med = project would not meet Manual criteria for proposed treatments, but accepted by CDFW/NOAA engineers; No = project would not meet Manual criteria or is not accepted by engineers.	0	-1		DNF
11. 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 treatments proposed use material of the size and type appropriate for the area; No = none of the treatments proposed use material of the size and type appropriate for the area.	0			-5
12. Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Monitoring Status and Trends (MD)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Quality Assurance and Quality Control Plan or Reference Documents do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. The project is feasible in terms of methodology for the focal species and watershed. Yes = project methodology is feasible; Med = specified concerns (see comments below) resulting in reduced feasibility; Low = specified concerns (see comments below) resulting in questionable feasibility; No = infeasible methodology.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Proposed methods and analysis will provide scientifically and statistically valid population information. Yes = methods and analysis will provided valid population information; Med = specified concerns on data and/or analysis for status and/or trend; No = valid population data will not be provided	0	-1.5		-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
<p>4. The proposal <u>meets at least one</u> of the following criteria meant to ensure the project follows the methods and intended uses of Fish Bulletin 180 and provides valid population status and/or trend information (check all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Study implements spawning surveys.</u> Proposal demonstrates it will estimate adult abundance using redd surveys or another spawner survey method approved by CDFW. The proposal uses a CDFW approved, established sampling frame using a generalized random tessellation sampling (GRTS) protocol. <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Study implements carcass surveys.</u> Proposal demonstrates this methodology will be used for coho and Chinook salmon: (1) when high flows during mark recapture surveys allow significant number of salmonids to pass unmonitored; and/or (2) to assess population age structure and diversity. <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Study implements fixed counting stations (e.g., camera, weir, or trap).</u> (i) Proposed location is a stream in the South Central or Southern Distinct Population Segment. If proposal location is a watershed with two or more anadromous salmonid species, the proposal provides detailed justification for use. (ii) Proposal demonstrates the fixed counting station is appropriate for species and location. (iii) For projects that propose fish identification using sonar camera technology, the proposal demonstrates that a secondary method will be used to distinguish focus species. <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Study implements life cycle monitoring stations (LCM).</u> Proposal demonstrates the project establishes a complete LCM adhering to all the following criteria: (i) Provides a scientific, valid measure of annual adult spawner abundance from an appropriately located and functional counting facility (e.g. weir, camera, trap); (ii) Provides a spawner survey estimate of adult abundance using the GRTS sampling within the established sampling frame; and (iii) Provides an estimate of the number and timing of outmigrating smolts at an appropriate location and time. <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Study implements surveys of juvenile spatial distribution.</u> Proposal demonstrates that it will estimate spatial distribution of either juveniles using snorkel surveys and/or electrofish sampled within the sampling frame and GRTS protocol. Sampling can be incorporated into an ESU-level spatial distribution estimate. <input type="checkbox"/> <u>Study evaluates population diversity.</u> Proposal demonstrates it will provide a scientifically valid evaluation and/or historical or temporal comparison of genetic, morphological, physiological, and/or life history diversity, or changes in diversity, at an identified spatial scale using a scientifically justifiable sampling and estimation method. <p>Yes = one or more boxes checked; No = no boxes checked.</p>	0			-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
5. For <u>existing</u> monitoring projects funded by CDFW, the grantee has delivered to CDFW all required data, analysis, and reports related to past and open monitoring grants, and the latest final report. Yes = grantee has delivered all data, analyses and reports related to past and open FRGP monitoring grants, and the latest final report; Med = grantee has delivered all data, analysis, and reports, including the final report from past FRGP grant(s) and is in the process of submitting data, analyses, and reports from its current FRGP grant, and proposal includes a letter from CDFW regional office of a final report due date; No = grantee has failed to deliver all required information from past CDFW grants, and is delinquent in delivering required information under an open CDFW grant.	0	-0.5		DNF
6. For <u>new</u> monitoring proposals, the proposal includes an example of previous work that demonstrates ability to collect, summarize, analyze, and interpret data appropriate to project proposed. Yes = proposal included examples of previous work demonstrating the ability to accomplish all four monitoring project elements above [examples must be attached or proposal must include electronic link to examples]; Med = proposal includes an example of previous work that demonstrates the ability to collect and summarize data, but does not demonstrate the ability to analyze and interpret data; No = proposal does not includes examples of previous work demonstrating the ability to summarize, analyze, and interpret data.	0	-1		-2.5

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Monitoring Watershed Restoration (MO)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the "Yes" column indicate "N/A" in lieu of "0".

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Quality Assurance and Quality Control Plan or Reference Documents do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Project monitoring goals are clearly defined and objectives are quantifiable with proposed study design. Yes = project monitoring goals are clearly defined and objectives are quantifiable with proposed study design; Med = one element does not meet this standard; Low = two elements do not meet this standard; No = more than two element do not meet this standard.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. The proposal demonstrates the project will provide a scientifically valid evaluation of one of the following: a) implementation monitoring, b) effectiveness monitoring, or c) validation. Yes = A minimum of one element will be evaluated; No = No element will be evaluated.	0			-5
4. For existing monitoring projects funded by FRGP, Grantee has delivered to CDFW all data, analysis, and reports, required by previous and open FRGP monitoring grants, and the latest final report. Yes = grantee has delivered to CDFW all data, analyses, and reports related to closed grant(s) and is current in delivering all data, analysis, and reports required by an open FRGP grant; Med = grantee has delivered all data, analysis, and reports, including the final report related to past grant(s), but is not current in delivering all data, analysis, and reports required by an open FRGP grant; No = grantee has failed to deliver all required information from past FRGP grants, and is delinquent in delivering required information under an open FRGP grant.	0	-1		-5

<p>5. For new monitoring proposals, the application includes an example of previous work that demonstrates ability to summarize, and analyze/interpret data appropriate to project proposed. Yes = applicant or partners demonstrate ability to summarize and analyze/interpret data; Med = applicant or partners demonstrate ability to summarize, but analysis, or interpretation is not well demonstrated; No = applicant or partners do not demonstrate their ability.</p>	0	-1		-5
--	---	----	--	----

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Organizational Support (OR)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or Status Report do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Proposal will direct attention on one or more watershed(s) with no previous watershed organization or a watershed with previously ineffective planning effort. Yes = addresses more than one new watershed; Med = addresses at least one new watershed; No = does not address any new watersheds.	0	-0.5		-1
3. Proposal documents local landowner support for project implementation after project design is completed. Yes = Landowner support is documented by landowner access or a detailed description is provided of how landowner interest will be secured; 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	-1.5	-3
4. Proposal identifies measurable tasks to be accomplished in the watershed to develop and implement plan-based restoration projects for focus species or their habitat (i.e., develop watershed plan etc.). Yes = measurable tasks are identified and described in detail; Med = some measurable tasks are identified and described in detail; No = measurable tasks not identified or described in detail.	0	-0.25		-5

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
5. The proposal demonstrates a willingness and commitment to work with others to achieve the organization's goals and how it might enhance other efforts within the geographic extent of the organization. Yes = proposal effectively describes how the group will work with others to achieve the project goals and enhance efforts geographically; Med = proposal only partially describes how the group will work with others to achieve the project goals and enhance efforts geographically; No = the proposal doesn't demonstrate a willingness and commitment to work with others or enhance efforts geographically.	0	-0.5		-5
6. For existing groups funded by FRGP, Status Report identifies the group's accomplishments including past FRGP deliverables, outreach success, watershed planning and assessment, habitat restoration implementation, and other CDFW objectives. Yes = all 5 elements are included in report; Med = only 3 elements are included in the report; Low = only 2 elements are included in the report; No = report doesn't identify the group's formation and activities.	0	-0.5	-1.5	-3
7. For new groups or existing groups new to FRGP , Status Report describes how the group was formed, the entities comprising the group, the group's goals and objectives, and what has been achieved to date. Yes = all 4 elements are described in report; Med = only 3 elements are described in the report; Low = only 2 elements are described in the report; No = report doesn't describe the group's formation and activities.	0	-0.5	-1.5	-3
8. For existing groups, past activities have led to development of a watershed plan Yes = watershed plan developed; Med = watershed plan in progress; No = no watershed plan.	0	-1		-2
9. For existing groups, applicant's past activities have led to plan-based implementation projects. Yes = implementation projects in the last 2 years; Med = implementation projects in the last 2 to 4 years; No = no implementation projects done or done more than 4 years ago.	0	-1		-5

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Project Design (PD)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information or the Existing Conditions Sketch do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Based on the CDFW/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
3. The proposed project would improve, protect, or enhance focus species habitat, which has been identified as a key limiting factor. Yes = project would improve, protect, or enhance habitat identified as a key limiting factor; Low = project would improve, protect, or enhance habitat identified as a contributing factor; No = project does not improve, protect or enhance any identified limiting or contributing factors.	0		-2	-5
4. Licensed professional(s) has the appropriate level of expertise for the type of project being designed. Yes = licensed professional has the appropriate expertise for the project being designed; No = licensed professional does not have the appropriate expertise for the project being designed.	0			-5
5. The proposal identifies all necessary surveys required to complete the design. Yes = identifies all required surveys; Low = does not identify 1 or 2 required surveys; No = does not identify more than 2 required surveys or any surveys.	0		-2	-3
6. Degree to which proposed project will develop a Final Plan (100%) which can be implemented directly after this project; 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 (less than 100%).	0	-1		-5

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
7. The proposed project includes all deliverables required for each design type which meet the specific design plan criteria. Yes = specific deliverables will meet design plan criteria; Med = deliverables will partially meet specific design plan criteria; No = deliverables will not meet specific design plan criteria.	0	-0.5		-2
8. Proposal documents local landowner support for project implementation after project design is completed. Yes = landowner support is documented by landowner access or a detailed description is provided 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
9. Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Public Involvement (PI)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Status Report do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Proposal will direct attention on one or more watershed(s) with no previous watershed organization or a watershed with previously ineffective planning effort. Yes = addresses one or more watersheds; Med = addresses at least one new watershed; No = does not address any new watersheds.	0	-0.5		-1
3. Proposal will continue outreach, watershed planning efforts and/or implementation of priority restoration projects based on previous watershed planning. Yes = continues outreach, watershed planning and implementation of priority project(s) or not applicable; Med = continues <u>at least 2</u> elements (outreach, watershed planning, or implementation of priority restoration projects); No = proposal only focuses on outreach efforts.	0	-0.5		-2
4. Proposal identifies measurable tasks to be accomplished in the region’s watersheds to address key factors limiting affected focus species or their habitat which directly supports local focus species habitat restoration and State and Federal recovery efforts. Yes = includes measurable tasks addressing key limiting factors which supports habitat restoration; No = does not include measurable tasks addressing key limiting factors which supports habitat restoration.	0			-5
5. Proposal demonstrates the current extent of regional stakeholder support through multiple partnerships and/or non-traditional partnerships. Yes = proposal includes a list of regional traditional and non-traditional partners; Med = proposal includes a list of traditional partners but no non-traditional partners or proposal includes only one type of partnership but describes how it will bring in non-traditional partners; No = proposal doesn’t include a list of regional traditional and non-traditional partners.	0	-0.5		DNF

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
6. The proposal demonstrates a willingness and commitment to work with others to achieve the organization's goals and how it might enhance other efforts within the geographic extent of the organization. Yes = proposal effectively describes how the group will work with others to achieve project goals; Med = proposal only partially describes how the group will work with others to achieve project goals; No = the proposal doesn't demonstrate a willingness and commitment to work with others.	0	-0.5		-5
7. If proposal is for AmeriCorps support, the proposal describes placement across the entire FRGP area. Yes = corps member will be placed in 4 Coastal CDFW regions; Med = corps member will be placed in 3 coastal regions; Low = corps members will be placed in 2 coastal regions, No = corps members will be placed in only 1 coastal region.	0	-0.5	-1	-3
8. If proposal is for AmeriCorps support, the proposal describes in detail the process by which outreach is conducted and corps member sites are selected. Yes = detailed description of outreach and member site selection; Med = description lacks some detail of outreach and member site selection; Low = description is unclear on outreach and member site selection; No = no description of outreach and member site selection.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-5
9. For existing groups funded by FRGP, Status Report identifies the group's accomplishments including past FRGP deliverables, outreach success, watershed planning and assessment, habitat restoration implementation, and other CDFW objectives. Yes = all 5 elements are identified in report; Med = only 3 elements are identified in the report; Low = only 2 elements are identified in the report; No = report doesn't identify the group's formation and activities.	0	-0.5	-1.5	-3
10. For new groups or existing groups new to FRGP , Status Report describes how the group was formed, the entities comprising the group, the group's goals and objectives, and what has been achieved to date. Yes = all 4 elements are described in report; Med = only 3 elements are described in the report; Low = only 2 element are described in the report; No = report doesn't describe the group's formation and activities.	0	-0.5	-1.5	-3
11. For existing groups, past activities have contributed to regional prioritization and/or watershed planning. Yes = activities have directly contributed to regional and watershed planning; Med = activities have regional prioritization planning effort; No = no contribution to regional planning effort.	0	-1		-2
12. For existing groups, applicants past activities have led to <u>designs</u> that were based on regional and/or watershed specific planning efforts. Yes = NA or activities have led to 100% designs; Med = activities have only lead to feasibility studies or less than 100% design; No = no design work initiated by applicant.	0	-1		-2

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
13. Applicants past activities have led to plan-based <u>implementation</u> projects. Yes = not applicable (NA) or implementation projects in the last 2 years; Med = implementation projects in the last 2-4 years; No = no implementation projects done or done more than 4 years ago.	0	-1		-5

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

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

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information or the Reference Document(s) do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Based on the CDFW/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
3. The proposed project will develop complete watershed plan: Yes = Complete watershed plan developed; Med = complete ranch implementation plan developed; Low = Specific assessment completed; No = watershed plan, ranch implementation plan, or assessment will not be completed.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-5
4. The proposed project encompasses or completes an entire watershed or sub-watershed. Yes = 80-100% of the entire watershed or sub-watershed; Med = 70-79% of the entire watershed or sub-watershed; Low = 50-69% of the entire watershed or sub-watershed; No = less than 50% of the entire watershed or sub-watershed.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
5. If proposed planning is based on previous watershed or ranch planning, or watershed assessments, the cited watershed planning or assessment document is acceptable to CDFW. Yes = cited watershed planning/assessment document is acceptable to CDFW; No = cited watershed planning or assessment document is unacceptable to CDFW.	0			-5
6. All survey methodologies proposed for use are identified with a reference for the survey methodology. Yes = all survey methodologies have been identified with a reference; Med = 1 or 2 survey methodologies have not been identified with a reference; No = more than 2 survey methodologies have not been identified with a reference.	0	-0.5		-3

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
7. All survey methodologies proposed for use are described in the Manual or are acceptable to CDFW. Yes = assessment protocols used are described in the Manual or are acceptable to CDFW; No = assessment protocols are not in the Manual, unacceptable, or inappropriate.	0			DNF
8. Proposal documents at least 50% landowner support (for the intended scope of the project) for plan development or assessments or there is a detailed description of how landowner support will be secured. Yes = at least 50% if landowner support is documented by landowner access; Med = not all landowners have been contacted, but there is a detailed description to ensure landowner support; No = applicant has not demonstrated contact with landowners and there is not a detailed description to ensure landowner support, or landowner support is questionable.	0	-0.5		-5
9. If there are significant social issues associated with successful restoration of the watershed, the proposal clearly addresses those issues which will enable restoration to be done, or references a prior document which sufficiently addresses those issues which will enable restoration to be done. Yes = proposal clearly addresses social issues or references a prior document which sufficiently addresses the issues; No = proposal does not clearly address social issues or does not reference a prior document.	0			-5
10. If proposed project is an instream flow study, contact with State Water Board is demonstrated and key elements of the plan are identified. Yes = contact with State Water Board demonstrated and key elements of the plan are identified; No = contact with State Water Board is not demonstrated and key elements of the plan are not identified.	0			-5
11. If the proposed project is database creation and maintenance, a complete ready to use database which will compile information regarding focus species, their habitat, and habitat management or restoration with appropriate QA/QC maintenance will be developed. Yes = completes a ready to use database compiling focus species information and has appropriate QA/QC maintenance; No = does not complete a ready to use database compiling focus species information, or does not have appropriate QA/QC/maintenance.	0			-5
12. The proposed project includes all deliverables required for each planning type (i.e. plan, assessment, flow study, database) which will clearly convey limiting factors and prioritize restoration activities to landowners and other interested parties. Yes = deliverables will clearly convey limiting factors and prioritize restoration activities; Med = deliverables will partially convey limiting factors or partially prioritize restoration activities; No = deliverables will not clearly convey limiting factors and prioritize restoration activities.	0	-1		-3

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
13. Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Cooperative Rearing (RE)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Five Year Management Plan do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. The proposed project is for management and operation of focus species rearing projects. Yes = project is for management of focus species rearing projects; No = project is for design or construction of rearing facilities or purchase of equipment.	0			DNF
3. Focus species raised by the project will be released at sites within the boundaries of the source population. Yes = release sites are within the boundaries of source population; Low = release sites adjacent to the source population; No = release site not in or adjacent to source population.	0		-1.5	-5
4. The proposed project is approved in writing by CDFW and NOAA. Yes = Project is approved in writing by CDFW and NOAA; No = project is not approved in writing by CDFW and NOAA.	0			DNF
5. The proposed project objective is recovery and restoration of focus species. Yes = Project objective is recovery and restoration of focus species; No = Project objective is production.	0			-5
6. Released fish are marked according to CDFG Commission Guidelines for Cooperative Rearing Projects and CDFW/NMFS standards for effectiveness monitoring. Yes = all released fish are marked according to stated guidelines and standards; No = fish released are not marked according to stated guidelines and standards.	0			DNF

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
7. If extended fish rearing (greater than 5 years) is needed the proposal includes a detailed Five-Year Management Plan with all elements listed in the Manual. Yes = plan describes all elements listed in the Manual or not applicable (rearing is less than 5 years); Med = plan is missing one elements listed in the Manual; Low = plan is missing two elements listed in the Manual; No = plan is missing more than 2 elements listed in the Manual or there is no plan.	0	-1	-2	-3

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Fish Screens (SC)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Intermediate Plan or Water Law Compliance Documents of Use do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Based on the CDFW/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
3. Water right is documented. 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. Yes = water right is documented with appropriate paperwork; No = water right is not documented.	0			-5
4. Diversion flow is monitored by a gauge at or near the point of diversion, and the diversion will be operated in compliance with water rights regulations. Yes = flow is monitored by a gauge and the diversion will be operated in compliance with water rights regulations; No = flow is not monitored by a gauge or the diversion will not be operated in compliance with water rights regulations.	0			-5
5. Proposed screen meets CDFW and NOAA Fisheries screening criteria. Yes = meets CDFW and NOAA Fisheries screening criteria; Med = CDFW or NOAA Fisheries accepted variance; No = does not meet criteria and no accepted variance.	0	-1		DNF

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
6. The diversion operator commits to providing design flow to the fish screen bypass at all times when water is being diverted and focus species may be present. Yes = the operator commits to provide design flow to fish screen bypass at all times when water is being diverted and focus species may be present; No = the operator has not committed to provide design flow to fish screen bypass at all times when water is being diverted and focus species may be present.	0			DNF
7. During the diversion season, water quality and quantity are optimal (connectivity of stream with critical riffle depths of at least 0.8 foot and water temperatures optimal for the focus species). Yes = water quality and quantity are optimal for focus species to be returned to the stream; Med = either water quality or quantity are sub-optimal for focus species to be returned to the stream; No = water quality and quantity are not optimal for focus species to be returned to the stream.	0	-1		DNF
8. The responsible party has signed a current letter agreeing to the operation and maintenance (O&M) responsibilities identified in the PSN for the O&M Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreement for the project after the FRGP grant ends. Yes = current letter has been signed agreeing to the O&M responsibilities identified in the PSN for an O&M LSAA after the grant ends; No = there is no current letter signed agreeing to O&M responsibilities identified in the PSN for an O&M LSAA after the grant ends.	0			DNF
9. A survey of the project reach substantiates the presence of the focus species. Yes = focus species is/are present; Med = existing plan details steps to be implemented to return the focus species to the project reach in the next five (5) years; No = focus species is/are not present and no plan to return the focus species to the target reach in the next 5 years.	0	-1		-5
10. Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Private Sector Technical Training and Education (TE)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the "Yes" column indicate "N/A" in lieu of "0".

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Evaluation Plan do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Based on the CDFW/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
3. Project provides private sector training and education in the field of anadromous salmonid habitat analysis and restoration in the following ways (check all that apply): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Teaches private landowners about practical means of improving land and water management practices that, if implemented, will contribute to protection and restoration of focus species stream habitat; <input type="checkbox"/> Scholarship funding for attending workshops and conferences that teach restoration techniques; <input type="checkbox"/> Operation of non-profit restoration technical schools; <input type="checkbox"/> Production of restoration training and education workshops and conferences. Yes = one or more boxes are checked; No = no boxes are checked.	0			-5

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
<p>4. The proposed project provides training or technical education to improve technical skills necessary to successfully complete development or implementation of one or more of the following watershed and anadromous fishery conservation activities (check all that apply):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Fish passage improvement project; <input type="checkbox"/> Conservation easement and other incentive programs; <input type="checkbox"/> Protecting and improving water quality and quantity; <input type="checkbox"/> Education needed to further regional/county restoration efforts; <input type="checkbox"/> Engineering design work specific to fisheries restoration; <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent easement or fee title to riparian/floodplain habitat along focus species streams which result in protection of focus species refugia; <input type="checkbox"/> Road surface drainage upgrades and associated fine sediment reduction activities; <input type="checkbox"/> Erosion control in upslope areas (e.g. non-road erosion prevention and control project, remediation); <input type="checkbox"/> Training in protocols used to conduct watershed, habitat, or species assessments in focus species streams, which identify limiting factors for determining priority restoration projects, leading to implementation; <input type="checkbox"/> Training in protocols used in Coastal Monitoring of focus species; <input type="checkbox"/> Training in techniques used in water conservation; <input type="checkbox"/> Training in techniques used to develop and complete TMDL implementation plans (e.g. ranch plans); <input type="checkbox"/> Training in techniques used in riparian restoration; <input type="checkbox"/> Training in techniques used in instream habitat restoration. <p>Yes = one or more boxes are checked; No = no boxes are checked.</p>	0			-5
<p>5. The proposed project is a collaboration involving non-profit, for-profit, tribe, and/or public entities. Yes = project is a collaboration involving the listed entities; No = project does not collaborate with the listed entities.</p>	0			-0.5
<p>6. Proposal includes an evaluation plan which details the following: education objectives, quantifiable educational gains in participant knowledge, how participant will demonstrate whether the project has met their expectations and be able to make programmatic recommendations impacting future projects, how success will be measured (such as pre-and post-testing and pre-and post-attendee surveys), performance standards, or an assessment rubric, and the feedback loop for adjusting curriculum to better meet objective standards. Yes = evaluation plan details all specific requirements; Med = evaluation plan is missing two specific requirements; No = evaluation plan is missing more than two specific requirements.</p>	0	-1		DNF

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
7. The proposed project addresses regional restoration needs served by the training. Yes = technical education addressing limiting factors in the local watershed(s); Med = technical education is general with no specificity to local watershed(s) limiting factors, but has useful regional restoration application; No = opportunistic training with no specificity to local watershed(s) limiting factors, and limited or no regional restoration application.	0	-0.5		-2
8. The proposed project promotes watershed stewardship, land and water management practices, training, and education with the goal of having landowners, resource professionals, restorationists, and communities increase their technical knowledge to better preserve and restore focus species habitat. Yes = promotes goal of increasing technical knowledge to preserve and restore focus species habitat; Med = general referenced to goal of increasing technical knowledge to preserve and restore focus species habitat; No = project does not meet goal of increasing technical knowledge to preserve and restore focus species habitat.	0	-0.5		-1.5
9. Proposal identifies specific restoration actions which will be completed in local focus species streams as part of the training. Yes = proposal includes specific restoration actions which will be completed in local focus species streams as part of the training; No = proposal does not include specific restoration actions which will be completed in local focus species streams as part of the training.	0			-1
10. Proposal describes the need for specific technical education and local area stakeholder support. Yes = the need for the specific technical education and local area stakeholder support is described; No = the need for the specific technical education and local area stakeholder support is not described.	0			-1
11. Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Water Conservation Measures (WC)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the “Yes” column indicate “N/A” in lieu of “0”.

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Conceptual Plan or Water Law Compliance Documents do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Based on the CDFW/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
3. The proposal includes 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. Yes = documents included demonstrates the validity of ownership for the water right being proposed or modified; No = documents included do not demonstrate the validity of the ownership for the water right being proposed or modified.	0			DNF
4. If the proposed project will utilize Chapter 10, Section 1707 of the California Water Code to dedicate the water conserved, the proposal describes 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. Yes = all elements listed are described in detail; No = elements are not all described in detail or elements are missing.	0			DNF

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
5. For water conservation projects that utilize forbearance agreements or instream flow leases, the proposal describes the local organization that will be responsible for developing the agreement and/or lease, its experience in doing this type of work, and organizational capacity to develop such agreements and to coordinate post-project water monitoring and water use in the watershed. Yes = all elements listed are described in detail; No = elements are not all described in detail or elements are missing.	0			DNF
6. A survey on the target stream conducted in the proposed project vicinity substantiates the quality and quantity of the <u>habitat</u> in the vicinity of the proposed project. Yes = survey conducted substantiates habitat quality and quantity in the project vicinity; No = survey not conducted.	0			-5
7. A survey on the target stream documents the quality of the <u>water</u> in the target stream. Yes = optimal water quality for focus species; Med = mostly optimal water quality for focus species with seasonal sub-optimal water quality; Low = mostly sub-optimal water quality; No = Unknown water quality.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
8. Reduced water quality or quantity from water extraction or tailwater documented by, and determined to be, degrading for focus species habitat by a qualified biologist and/or hydrologist. Yes = water quality or quantity from water extraction documented by qualified personnel and determined to be degrading for focus species; No = water quality or quantity from water extraction has not been documented by qualified personnel or determined to be degrading for focus species.	0			-2
9. 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 focus species habitat. Yes = timing of water saved or returned to stream provides greatest benefit to focus species; Med = timing of water saved or returned to stream provides some benefit to focus species; No = timing of water saved or returned to stream provides no benefit to focus species.	0	-1		-2
10. Water losses and potential savings realized through project implementation, identified by a qualified hydrologist. Yes = water losses and potential saving is identified by a qualified hydrologist; No = water losses and potential saving have not been identified by a qualified hydrologist.	0			-2
11. The proposed 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. Yes = project will be implemented and operated according to stated approvals and compliance; No = project will not be implemented and operated according to stated approvals and compliance.	0			-2

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
12. Project will reduce tailwater generation through improved irrigation systems or assist in recovery and reuse of tailwater, to prevent discharge of tailwater to stream. Yes = project will reduce tailwater generation; No = project will not reduce tailwater generation.	0			-2
13. Tailwater system is protected from storm or high water events. Yes = tailwater system is protected from storms or high water; No = tailwater system is not protected from storms or high water.	0			-1
14. Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

Biological Review Water Measuring Devices (WD)

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

Proposal Name: _____

Initial score is 5 for the combined Program Criteria Review and project type Biological Review score sheets. Points deducted from the Program Criteria Review will be added to the point deduction on the Biological Review to determine the final score. For scoring criteria not applicable to a proposal, in the "Yes" column indicate "N/A" in lieu of "0".

	Mark one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all required supplemental information conforms to the criteria described in PSN; Med = 1 piece of required supplemental information does not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; Low = 2 pieces of required supplemental information do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN; No = more than 2 pieces of required supplemental information, or the Intermediate or Conceptual Plan or Water Law Compliance Documents do not conform to the criteria described in the PSN.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Based on the CDFW/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
3. The water measuring device proposed is to help manage water diversions in order to avoid or minimize impacts to focus species, or to monitor reduced water quality or quantity from water diversion(s) as documented by a qualified hydrologist and determined to be degrading to focus species habitat by a qualified biologist. Yes = water measuring device addresses documented water quality or quantity issues or to help manage water diversions; No = water measuring device does not address documented water quality or quantity issues or to help manage water diversions.	0			-5
4. Instream gauges are positioned to track mainstem flow as well as tributary flow that contributes flow for fish recovery. Yes = gauges are positioned to track mainstem and tributary flow; No = gauges are not positioned to track mainstem and tributary flows.	0			-1
5. Gauge will be installed in support of focus species recovery actions. Yes = gauge installation is in support of focus species recovery actions; No = gauge installation is not in support of focus species recovery actions.	0			-5
6. The gauge will be operated and maintained after the expiration of the funded grant. Yes = gauge will be operated and maintained after the expiration of the funded grant; No = gauge will not be operated and maintained after the expiration of the funded grant.	0			-1
7. Field review conducted. [(Y or N) Informational, therefore no score.] If field review not conducted explain.				

Biological Review Point Deductions: _____

Program Criteria Review Point Deductions: _____

Final Score (5 – total point deductions): _____

FRGP Peer Review Committee (PRC)

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

Proposal Name: _____

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: