

Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Technical Review Instructions

Standard scoring criteria:

- **5 points** - criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale
- **4 points** - the criterion is fully addressed but is supported by less thorough documentation or less sufficient rationale
- **3 points** - the criterion is less than fully addressed and is supported by less thorough documentation or less sufficient rationale
- **2 points** - the criterion is marginally addressed or the documentation or rationale is incomplete or insufficient
- **1 point** - the criterion is minimally addressed or no documentation or rationale is presented
- **0 points** - the criterion is not addressed

	Review Criteria	Weight
1	<p>Project Background / Scientific Merit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does the proposal describe the project purpose and justify the project need? ● Does the proposal describe project background, history, and strategy for future phases? ● Is the scientific basis for the project clearly explained and based on the best available science? ● Are the goals and objectives clearly stated? ● Are the project location and boundaries clear? Do the maps have the required information? <p>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</p>	1
2	<p>Diversity and Significance of Benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is an appropriate GHG Benefit quantification methodology properly completed? ● Does the project provide multiple co-benefits and demonstrate their significance? ● Are the proposed outcomes measurable and quantifiable? ● Does the proposal sufficiently describe landscape-scale significance of the project? ● Does the proposal address climate change stressors? ● How well does the proposal provide climate change adaptation for target species and/or their habitats by providing them adaptive ability to climate change stressors? <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5 points - Proposals provide multiple benefits that are highly significant and are supported by thorough and well-presented documentation ● 4 points - Proposals provide multiple benefits that are highly significant but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking ● 3 points - Proposals provide multiple benefits that are of a moderate level of significance and are supported by thorough and well-presented documentation ● 2 points - Proposals provide multiple benefits that are of a moderate level of significance but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking ● 1 point - Proposals provide a low level of multiple benefits or lack adequate support for benefits claimed ● 0 points - Proposals that do not provide multiple benefits 	2

Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Technical Review Instructions

3	<p>Project Readiness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To what extent has environmental compliance (e.g., CEQA/NEPA), design plans, and permitting been completed? ● Was CEQA / NEPA compliance completed prior to proposal submittal? If not, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What is the anticipated date to complete CEQA / NEPA compliance? Is the timeline adequately justified and reasonable? ○ Are the CEQA / NEPA lead agencies identified and is their acceptance of that role adequately documented? ● Were design plans and Basis of Design (BOD) at a Conceptual (~30%) level of development, or greater, submitted with the proposal? ● Were all necessary permits secured prior to proposal submittal? If not, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What is the status of the permit applications? ○ What is the anticipated date to complete permitting? Is the timeline adequately justified and reasonable? <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5 points – Proposal meets the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CEQA compliance completed prior to proposal submittal ○ Design plans and BOD at the Draft Final (~90%) level of development submitted with the proposal ○ All applicable permits acquired prior to proposal submittal ● 3 to 4 points – Proposal meets the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposal presents a timeline to complete CEQA compliance prior to anticipated date of award notifications (November 2018) that is adequately justified and reasonable ○ Design plans and BOD at an Intermediate (~65%) level of development, or greater, submitted with the proposal ○ Proposal identified all necessary permits and a timeline to secure those permits that is adequately justified and reasonable ● 1 to 2 points – Proposal meets the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposal presents a timeline to complete CEQA compliance no later than 12 months after the anticipated date of award notifications that is adequately justified and reasonable ○ Design plans and BOD at a Conceptual (~30%) level of development, or greater, submitted with the proposal ○ Proposal identifies all necessary permits and a timeline to secure those permits that is adequately justified and reasonable ● 0 points – Proposed projects in which CEQA compliance is likely to be completed more than 12 months after the anticipated date of award notification 	2
4	<p>Approach, Feasibility, and Scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is the proposal sufficiently detailed to serve as a statement of work for a grant agreement? ● Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? ● Is the project technically feasible from a biological perspective? ● Is it feasible to complete the project within the term of the grant agreement? <p>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</p>	3
5	<p>GHG Benefit Monitoring and Reporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Are the approaches to measure, quantify, and report GHG Benefits (pre- and post-implementation) clearly defined and adequate? ● Does the proposal describe how long-term monitoring would be accomplished through partnerships, matching funds, etc.? <p>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</p>	2

Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Technical Review Instructions

6	<p>Co-Benefit Monitoring and Reporting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Are the co-benefit performance measures appropriate and adequate to demonstrate outcomes? ● Are the approaches to monitor, assess, and report outcomes related to proposed co-benefits clearly defined and reasonable? ● Does the proposal leverage existing monitoring efforts or produce data that can be integrated with such efforts? ● Does the proposal contain an adequate description of baseline monitoring in order to support effectiveness monitoring? <p>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</p>	1
7	<p>Durability of Investment & Long-term Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does the proposal describe how the restoration project will be managed to maintain benefits for at least 50 years? ● How well does the applicant explain plans for long-term management and sustainability? ● Does the applicant demonstrate tenure to and control of the project site to be restored for a period of at least 50 years, or document the intent to obtain adequate land tenure/site control? <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5 points - Proposals that provide a well-defined long-term management plan and include documentation of protection in perpetuity (e.g., underpinned by a conservation easement) ● 4 points - Proposals that provide a well-defined long-term management plan and adequate land tenure/site control to maintain benefits for at least 50 years ● 3 to 2 points - Proposals that provide a less-than-well-defined long-term management plan and adequate land tenure/site control to maintain benefits for at least 50 years ● 1 point - Proposals that provide an inadequate long-term management plan, but appear to have adequate land tenure/site control for a period of at least 50 years ● 0 points - Proposals that lack adequate land tenure/site control for period of at least 50 years 	1
8	<p>Project Team Qualifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How well does the proposal demonstrate that the project team (including subcontractors) has the appropriate experience, facilities/equipment, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks? ● Where applicable, is a licensed professional(s) (engineer or geologist) included on the project team or provide justification for why the services of such a licensed professional are not necessary? ● Where applicable, how well does the proposal demonstrate appropriate or necessary partnerships to complete the project? <p>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</p>	1
9	<p>Schedule and Deliverables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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? <p>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</p>	2

Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Technical Review Instructions

<p>10</p>	<p>Applicant Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does the proposed budget accurately detail all requested costs? ● To what extent does the budget avoid unspecified lump sums, exclude ineligible costs, and request an appropriate indirect charge rate? ● Are costs appropriate for the scope of work? ● If applicable, is the subcontractor budget(s) accurate? <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5 points - Proposals for which the Budget is detailed and accurate will receive 5 points ● 3 to 4 points - Proposals for which the Budget contains moderate detail, limited inaccuracies or unspecified lump sums of up to 20 percent of the total Budget ● 1 to 2 points - Proposals for which the Budget lacks sufficient detail, includes; many inaccuracies, unspecified lump sums of 20 to 50 percent of the total Budget, or ineligible costs/indirect charge rate ● 0 points - Proposals for which the Budget lacks sufficient detail, is inaccurate, contains unspecified lump sums exceeding 50 percent of the total Budget, or ineligible costs/indirect charge rate 	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>
<p>11</p>	<p>Budget Justification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Is the Budget Justification appropriate to the work and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs by task? ● Are the tasks shown in the Budget Justification consistent with the tasks shown in the Approach and Scope of Work and Timeline? <p>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>Cost Share</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● To what extent does the project provide secured federal, State, private, and/or local cost share? ● Cost share must be secured at time of proposal submission and spent during the term of the grant. <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5 points - Cost share of >40% ● 4 points - Cost share of 31-40% ● 3 points - Cost share of 21-30% ● 2 points - Cost share of 11-20% ● 1 point - Cost share of 1-10% ● 0 points - Cost share of 0% 	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>Community Support and Collaboration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Does the project have public and institutional support at the local, regional, or larger scale? ● Does the applicant demonstrate community engagement in the project by providing funds, in-kind contributions, partnerships, or other evidence of support? ● Does the applicant describe efforts to include stakeholders in project planning, design, outreach/education, implementation, monitoring, maintenance, etc.? <p>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>

Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Technical Review Instructions

14	<p>Priority Populations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Step 1: Identify the Priority Population(s) - Is the project site located within a census tract identified as a disadvantaged community or low-income community, or directly benefits residents of a low-income household? ● Step 2: Address a Need - Does the proposed project meaningfully address an important community or household need for the identified priority population(s)? ● Step 3: Provide a Benefit - Does the proposed project provide at least one direct, meaningful, and assured benefit to the identified priority population(s)? <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 5 points – Proposed project meets all of the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project area is within a census tract identified as a disadvantaged community or low-income community, or directly benefits residents of a low-income household. ○ Project meaningfully addresses an important community or household need for the identified priority population(s), and ○ Project provides at least one direct, meaningful and assured benefit to the identified priority population(s) ● 0 points - Application does not meet all three of the criteria listed above 	1
	Overall Evaluation	
	<p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify key strengths and successful outcomes likely to be realized. 	Not scored
	<p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify key deficiencies and outcomes that are unlikely to be realized. ● Describe opportunities to strengthen the proposal. 	Not scored
	<p>Red Flags</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identify significant issues that should be considered by the Selection Panel or should be addressed by the grant manager (if awarded). 	Not scored