

CDFW Proposition 1 Grant Programs - 2018

Technical Review Criteria Details

The following provides more detail on how each criterion listed in Table 3 of the PSN will be evaluated during the technical review process.

Technical / Scientific Merit

1. Purpose and Background / Scientific merit

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- Does the proposal describe the project purpose and justify the project need?
- Does the proposal describe project background, history, work completed to date, relationship to other projects, and strategy for completion of future phases? What would happen to the project if no funds were available from the CDFW? If the project is not implemented in the near future, what project opportunities or benefits could be lost and why.
- Is the underlying scientific basis for the proposed work clearly explained (i.e., does it include a clearly articulated conceptual model, if applicable), and is it based on the best available science?
- Are the goals, objectives, hypotheses, and questions clearly stated and internally consistent?
- Are the project location and boundaries clearly delineated? Do the maps have the required information?
- Does the application sufficiently describe landscape-scale significance of the project?

If you feel the project does not address one or more of the Solicitations priorities, note that in comments as a red flag with a reason why.

2. Community Support and Collaboration

Weight: 1, i.e., 5 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- Does the project have public and institutional support at the local, regional, or larger scale? This may include collaborators, partners, elected officials, supporters, other granting organizations, and engaged stakeholders.
- Does the proposal demonstrate that the community is engaged in the project by providing funds, in-kind contributions (e.g., administrative/ technical services, labor, materials, equipment), partnerships, or other evidence of support? Note: Letters of Support are optional.

- Does the project history or proposed scope of work include efforts to involve stakeholders in project planning, design, outreach/education, implementation, monitoring, maintenance, etc.?

Scientific Studies

- Is the Project Team partnered with collaborative workgroups or science initiatives (e.g., Interagency Ecological Program [IEP], Collaborative Adaptive Management Team, Delta Regional Monitoring Program)?

3. Project Outcomes – Project Outcomes: Diversity and Significance of the Benefits

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring:

- 5 points: Likely to provide multiple benefits that are highly significant and are supported by thorough and well-presented documentation.
- 4 points: Likely to provide multiple benefits that are highly significant but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking.
- 3 points: Likely to provide multiple benefits that are of a moderate level of significance and are supported by thorough and well-presented documentation.
- 2 points: Likely to provide multiple benefits that are of a moderate level of significance but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking.
- 1 point: Likely to provide a low level of multiple benefits or lack adequate support for benefits claimed.
- 0 points: Does not provide apparent benefit.

Evaluation Guidance:

- Does the proposal provide analysis and documentation to demonstrate the likelihood that the project will provide multiple benefits?
- Are the benefits likely to be significant?
- Are the anticipated outcomes measurable and quantifiable?

Examples of potential ecosystem benefits include:

- ◇ Climate change adaptation actions
- ◇ Restoration actions in response to natural disasters (e.g., high intensity wildfires, floods)
- ◇ Drought preparedness
- ◇ Integrated flood management
- ◇ Protection or improvement of water quality
- ◇ Use and reuse water more efficiently
- ◇ Expand environmental stewardship
- ◇ Protect or increase habitat for threatened and endangered species
- ◇ Protect strategically important lands within watersheds
- ◇ Reduce stressors on native species

Scientific Studies

- Does the project support synthesis activities that cross multiple existing programs or agency missions?

- Is the project relevant to multiple agencies and organizations throughout the Delta?

4. Climate Change Considerations

Weight: 1, i.e., 5 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- Does proposal address climate change stressors?
- How well does the proposal provide climate change adaptation for target ecosystems and/or species?
- Does the proposed project mitigate for climate change, i.e., sequester greenhouse gases?

Additional Considerations for Scientific Studies

- Will the proposed study improve scientific understanding of climate change effects and/or inform management responses to climate change?
- Will the proposed study produce information that will aid future assessments of climate change effects?

5. Approach, Feasibility, and Scope

Weight: 3, i.e., 15 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- Is there adequate description of the responsible parties and means by which each element of the project will be implemented (e.g., methods/techniques used, materials and equipment used)?
- Is the proposal's Approach and Scope of Work sufficiently detailed to serve as a statement of work for a grant agreement?
- Is the approach well designed and does it include tasks appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?
- Is the project technically feasible from a biological and engineering perspective?
- Is it feasible to complete the project within the term of the grant agreement?
- Does the project apply methods and technologies that are appropriate, understood, and well proven? If not, does the proposal provide an adequate basis for the use of new or innovative technology or practices?

6. Project Monitoring and Reporting / Scientific Studies: Timeliness and Need

Weight: 1, i.e., 5 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

6(a). Project Monitoring and Reporting

Implementation Projects

- Does the project's Monitoring and Reporting Plan demonstrate a clear and reasonable approach consistent with the project's objectives?
- Are the performance measures appropriate and adequate to demonstrate the project's outcomes?

- Does the proposal leverage existing monitoring efforts or produce data that can be readily integrated with such efforts, where applicable/feasible? For example, if the project includes riparian or other wetland restoration: does the monitoring plan include Level 2 (standardized rapid assessment, e.g. CRAM) monitoring?
- Does the proposal contain a description of baseline monitoring that would be or has been conducted?
- How well does the proposal demonstrate the means by which data and other information generated by the project will be handled, stored, transmitted, and made available to CDFW and the public?
- Where applicable, how well do proposed data management activities incorporate standards in the CDFW Scientific Integrity Policy, CDFW Minimum Data Standards, and address the specific requirements identified in PSN Section 3.12, Data Management (e.g., CEDEN, EcoAtlas)?

Planning Projects

- Does the proposal contain a reasonable description of baseline monitoring that would be or has already been conducted?
- Does the proposal identify how and when a monitoring plan will be developed in order to support future effectiveness monitoring?

6(b). Scientific Studies: Timeliness and Need

- Is the idea timely and is there strong opportunity for progress?
- Does the project have support that can be greatly enriched by focused short-term funding?
- Is the study justified relative to existing knowledge?
- To what extent does the project address key scientific uncertainties and fill important information gaps, e.g., those identified in the 2017-2021 Science Action Agenda?
- Is the project likely to generate novel information, methodologies, or approaches?
- Does the project have a high potential to address and resolve areas of scientific conflict?

7. Durability of Investment & Long-term Management

Weight: 1, i.e., 5 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria, except for Implementation projects; see below

Evaluation Guidance:

7(a). Implementation Projects

- Does the project describe steps needed to deliver and sustain beneficial outcomes in the long-term?
- How well does the applicant explain plans for long-term management and sustainability beyond the term of the grant agreement?

- Does the applicant demonstrate tenure to and control of the project site to be restored for at least 25 years, or document the intent to obtain adequate land tenure?

Scoring:

- 5 points: Provides a well-defined long-term management and maintenance strategy; includes documentation of protection in perpetuity.
- 4 points: Provides a well-defined long-term management and maintenance strategy for a minimum of 25 years
- 3 points: Provides a less-than-well-defined long-term management and maintenance strategy for less than 25 years.
- 1 to 2 points: Provides a less-than-well-defined long-term management and maintenance strategy for less than 25 years.
- 0 points: Provides an inadequate long-term management and maintenance strategy.

7(b). Planning Projects

- Will the project advance planning towards a specific future on-the-ground project (i.e., will it advance the project to a shovel-ready stage that qualifies for future implementation funding)?
- Is future implementation likely to proceed and yield the stated natural resource benefits?

7(c). Scientific Studies

- Is there a plan for widespread and effective dissemination of information gained from the project?
- Will the information produced by the project be useful to resource managers and policy-makers and inform water and natural resource policy, and restoration and management decisions in the Delta?

8. Project Team Qualifications

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- How well does the proposal demonstrate that the project team has the appropriate experience, facilities, equipment, and capacity to successfully perform the proposed tasks?
- Where applicable, does project design include a licensed professional in the project team or provide justification for why the services of such a licensed professional are not necessary?
- How well does the proposal demonstrate appropriate or necessary partnerships to complete the project?

Note: If the subcontractors have not been named, but the Applicant adequately describes the qualities of the desired subcontractors, do not subtract points.

9. Schedule and Deliverables

Weight: 3, i.e., 15 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- Does the schedule demonstrate a logical sequence and timing of project tasks?
- Does the project have reasonable milestones and appropriate deliverables?
- Do the tasks in the schedule align with the tasks in the Approach and Scope of Work and Timeline?

Project Costs

10. Applicant Budget

Weight: 1, i.e., 5 points maximum

Scoring:

- 5 points: Budget (including Subcontractor Budget) is detailed and accurate.
- 3 to 4 points: Budget (including Subcontractor Budget) contains moderate detail, limited inaccuracies or unspecified lump sums of up to 20 percent of the total Budget.
- 1 to 2 points: Budget (including Subcontractor Budget) lacks sufficient detail, includes; many inaccuracies, unspecified lump sums of 20 to 50 percent of the total Budget, or inappropriate costs/indirect charge rate.
- 0 points: Budget (including Subcontractor Budget) lacks sufficient detail, is inaccurate, or contains unspecified lump sums exceeding 50 percent of the total Budget.

Evaluation Guidance:

- Does the proposed Applicant Budget accurately detail all CDFW requested costs?
- To what extent does the budget avoid use of unspecified lump sums and exclude ineligible costs?
- Are costs appropriate for this kind of work?
- If applicable, is the attached Subcontractor Budget accurate?

Note: If Subcontractor has not yet been identified, do not subtract points for lack of detail in the Subcontractor budget.

11. Budget Justification

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- Is the proposed Budget Justification appropriate for the work proposed and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs by task (for both CDFW requested cost and cost share)?
- Are tasks shown in the Budget Justification consistent with the tasks shown in the Approach and Scope of Work and Timeline?

12. Cost Share

Weight: 1, i.e., 5 points maximum

Scoring:

- 5 points: > 40% secured cost share.
- 4 points: 31-40% secured cost share.
- 3 points: 21-30% secured cost share.
- 2 points: 11-20% secured cost share.
- 1 point: 1-10% secured cost share.
- 0 points: 0% secured cost share.

Evaluation Guidance:

- To what extent does the project provide secured federal, State, private, or local cost share? Cost share includes cash and in-kind services.
- Does proposal document that secured cost share will be spent between the anticipated award date (August 2018) and the end of the proposed grant agreement?

Overall Evaluation

1. Strengths

Instructions: Identify key strengths and successful outcomes likely to be realized.

2. Weaknesses

Instructions: Identify key deficiencies and outcomes that are unlikely to be realized.
Describe opportunities to strengthen the proposal.

3. Red Flags

Instructions: Identify significant issues that should be considered by the Selection Panel or should be addressed by the grant manager (if awarded).