

Engineering-Geologic Review Criteria

Engineering-Geologic Review Criteria (Planning)	Yes/No
Existing Site Conditions	
Did the proposal include an adequate discussion of existing site conditions?	
Appropriate Figures Provided	
Location Map	
Site Map/Photos	
Proposed Assessment	
If appropriate, did the proposal include an Alternatives Analysis as a task?	
Is the narrative detail provided adequate to determine appropriateness of proposed assessment tasks?	
Is the proposed assessment adequate for the type/location/complexity of proposed restoration?	
Project Team Qualifications	
Does the design team include appropriate technical expertise for project type?	
Budget	
Does the budget include sufficient dollars for the work described?	
Is the budget complete?	
Are reasonable amounts allocated to design components/expertise?	
Schedule	
Is the schedule adequate for data collection/modeling?	
Does the schedule include adequate time for agency review?	
Overall Score	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 0 – Insufficient information was provided to determine technical adequacy 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 – Concerns were identified that could impact project success 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 – The proposal appears to be technically adequate 	

Engineering-Geologic Review Criteria

Engineering-Geologic Review Criteria (Implementation)	Yes/No
Existing Site Conditions/Assessment	
Did the proposal include a detailed discussion of existing site-specific conditions/processes/problems that indicate competent assessment of said conditions?	
Was a detailed description of proposed restoration as it relates to existing regional and site-specific conditions included?	
Have all appropriate site assessments been included/identified?	
Were geomorphological setting and processes adequately described (as it relates to proposed restoration)?	
Where relevant, was regional and site-specific geology/hydrogeology discussion included (e.g., hydraulic connectivity of surface/subsurface interaction/ aquifer conditions)?	
Was an Alternatives Analysis completed? Were data gaps discussed?	
Design Plans	
Do the plans appear to meet minimum design level for implementation?	
Did proposal provide a detailed site plan locating existing and proposed features?	
Where relevant, were longitudinal profile and appropriately placed X-Sections completed?	
Do plans include cut/fill areas, pre- and post-restoration elevations?	
Where applicable, are plans stamped by an appropriate California licensed professional?	
Was an appropriately detailed topographic map provided, where topography is detailed enough to depict important elements of the restoration design?	
Engineering/Geology	
Did the proposal include design calculations?	
Was sufficient hydraulic information/analysis completed for the proposed restoration (e.g., Stream Stats, flow gages)?	
Where applicable, was modeling completed and appropriately documented (e.g., sediment load, hydraulic, surface/groundwater interaction)?	
Construction/Work Plan	
Was a detailed task list included? (e.g., mobilization, site prep, excavate, fill, install, plant, eradicate)	
Were appropriate deliverables included (e.g., updated model, additional assessments, as-builts, adaptive management plans, post-project monitoring details)?	
Were estimates of quantities of excavated material/fill, acres, feet, etc. provided? Are estimates consistent with figures/exhibits provided?	
Was a description of construction methods/restoration processes for each major restoration component provided?	

Engineering-Geologic Review Criteria

Feasibility	
Is it clear that appropriate professionals were included on the site assessment and design development team?	
Is appropriate technical information provided to support claims of benefits, likelihood of success, constructability, etc.?	
Budget	
Does the budget include sufficient dollars for the work described?	
Is the budget complete?	
Are all the appropriate items (e.g., dewatering, SWPPP) included in the budget?	
Schedule	
Is the schedule for assessment, construction, permitting, etc., reasonable?	
Overall Score	
0 – Plans do not appear to meet minimum design level or insufficient information was provided to determine technical adequacy	
1 – Concerns were identified that could impact project success	
2 – The proposal appears to be technically adequate	