

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

# Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Technical Review Instructions

<b>3</b>	<p><b>Project Readiness</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● To what extent has environmental compliance (e.g., CEQA/NEPA), design plans, and permitting been completed?</li> <li>● Was CEQA / NEPA compliance completed prior to proposal submittal? If not, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What is the anticipated date to complete CEQA / NEPA compliance? Is the timeline adequately justified and reasonable?</li> <li>○ Are the CEQA / NEPA lead agencies identified and is their acceptance of that role adequately documented?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Were design plans and Basis of Design (BOD) at a Conceptual (~30%) level of development, or greater, submitted with the proposal?</li> <li>● Were all necessary permits secured prior to proposal submittal? If not, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What is the status of the permit applications?</li> <li>○ What is the anticipated date to complete permitting? Is the timeline adequately justified and reasonable?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>5 points</b> – Proposal meets the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ CEQA compliance completed prior to proposal submittal</li> <li>○ Design plans and BOD at the Draft Final (~90%) level of development submitted with the proposal</li> <li>○ All applicable permits acquired prior to proposal submittal</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>3 to 4 points</b> – Proposal meets the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Proposal presents a timeline to complete CEQA compliance prior to anticipated date of award notifications (November 2018) that is adequately justified and reasonable</li> <li>○ Design plans and BOD at an Intermediate (~65%) level of development, or greater, submitted with the proposal</li> <li>○ Proposal identified all necessary permits and a timeline to secure those permits that is adequately justified and reasonable</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>1 to 2 points</b> – Proposal meets the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 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</li> <li>○ Design plans and BOD at a Conceptual (~30%) level of development, or greater, submitted with the proposal</li> <li>○ Proposal identifies all necessary permits and a timeline to secure those permits that is adequately justified and reasonable</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>0 points</b> – Proposed projects in which CEQA compliance is likely to be completed more than 12 months after the anticipated date of award notification</li> </ul>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<p><b>Approach, Feasibility, and Scope</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Is the proposal sufficiently detailed to serve as a statement of work for a grant agreement?</li> <li>● Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?</li> <li>● Is the project technically feasible from a biological perspective?</li> <li>● Is it feasible to complete the project within the term of the grant agreement?</li> </ul> <p><b>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</b></p>	<b>3</b>
<b>5</b>	<p><b>GHG Benefit Monitoring and Reporting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are the approaches to measure, quantify, and report GHG Benefits (pre- and post-implementation) clearly defined and adequate?</li> <li>● Does the proposal describe how long-term monitoring would be accomplished through partnerships, matching funds, etc.?</li> </ul> <p><b>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</b></p>	<b>2</b>

# Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Technical Review Instructions

<b>6</b>	<p><b>Co-Benefit Monitoring and Reporting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Are the co-benefit performance measures appropriate and adequate to demonstrate outcomes?</li> <li>● Are the approaches to monitor, assess, and report outcomes related to proposed co-benefits clearly defined and reasonable?</li> <li>● Does the proposal leverage existing monitoring efforts or produce data that can be integrated with such efforts?</li> <li>● Does the proposal contain an adequate description of baseline monitoring in order to support effectiveness monitoring?</li> </ul> <p><b>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</b></p>	<b>1</b>
<b>7</b>	<p><b>Durability of Investment &amp; Long-term Management</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does the proposal describe how the restoration project will be managed to maintain benefits for at least 50 years?</li> <li>● How well does the applicant explain plans for long-term management and sustainability?</li> <li>● 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?</li> </ul> <p><u>Scoring:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>5 points</b> - Proposals that provide a well-defined long-term management plan and include documentation of protection in perpetuity (e.g., underpinned by a conservation easement)</li> <li>● <b>4 points</b> - Proposals that provide a well-defined long-term management plan and adequate land tenure/site control to maintain benefits for at least 50 years</li> <li>● <b>3 to 2 points</b> - 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</li> <li>● <b>1 point</b> - 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</li> <li>● <b>0 points</b> - Proposals that lack adequate land tenure/site control for period of at least 50 years</li> </ul>	<b>1</b>
<b>8</b>	<p><b>Project Team Qualifications</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 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?</li> <li>● 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?</li> <li>● Where applicable, how well does the proposal demonstrate appropriate or necessary partnerships to complete the project?</li> </ul> <p><b>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</b></p>	<b>1</b>
<b>9</b>	<p><b>Schedule and Deliverables</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Does the schedule demonstrate a logical sequence and timing of project tasks?</li> <li>● Does the project have reasonable milestones and appropriate deliverables?</li> <li>● Do the tasks in the schedule align with the tasks in the Approach and Scope of Work and Timeline?</li> </ul> <p><b>Use Standard Scoring Criteria</b></p>	<b>2</b>

# Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Technical Review Instructions

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

# Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program Technical Review Instructions

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