

FY 2017-2018 Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program

Engineering-Geologic Review

Engineering-Geologic Review Criteria	Yes/No
Draft Final (90%) Designs and Basis of Design (BOD) Submitted	
Does project design appear to be at the final design phase?	
Did the BOD include a detailed discussion of existing site-specific conditions/processes/problems that indicate competent assessment/understanding of said conditions?	
Was appropriate pre-project monitoring conducted? Is post-project monitoring proposed?	
Was a detailed description of proposed restoration as it relates to existing regional and site-specific conditions included?	
Have all appropriate site assessments been completed?	
Was an Alternatives Analysis completed?	
Did the proposal include design calculations? If appropriate, was sufficient hydraulic or hydrogeologic information/analysis completed for the proposed restoration (e.g., Stream Stats, flow gages, piezometers)?	
Where applicable, was modeling completed and appropriately documented (e.g., sediment load, hydraulic, surface/groundwater interaction)?	
Was a description of construction methods/restoration processes for each major restoration component provided?	
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?	
Where applicable, are plans/reports stamped by an appropriate California licensed professional?	
Intermediate (65%) Design Plans and BOD Submitted	
Does project design appear to be at an intermediate design phase?	
Was/will appropriate pre-project monitoring (be) conducted? Was post-project monitoring proposed?	
Did the BOD include a detailed discussion of existing site-specific conditions/processes/problems that indicate competent assessment/understanding of said conditions?	
Was an Alternatives Analysis completed?	
Does the BOD report provide detailed discussion of assessments to date, and where applicable, identify data gaps?	

FY 2017-2018

Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program

Engineering-Geologic Review

Did proposal provide a detailed site plan locating existing and proposed features at an appropriate scale and with an accurate legend?	
Have appropriate assessments been completed or proposed? Are modeling, subsurface studies, longitudinal profile(s) and appropriately placed X-Sections completed?	
Was an appropriately detailed topographic map provided, where topography is detailed enough to depict important elements of the restoration design? If not, will appropriately detailed topographic data be gathered?	
Where applicable, do plans include cut/fill areas or pre- and post-restoration elevations?	
Was a detailed task list included? (e.g., assessment, 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)?	
Where applicable (grading, fixed instream work, groundwater data interpretation, etc.), are/will plans (be) stamped by an appropriate California licensed professional?	
Conceptual Design (30%) Plans and BOD	
Did the BOD include a detailed discussion of existing site-specific conditions/processes/problems that indicate competent assessment/understanding of said conditions?	
Are appropriate data gaps identified?	
Will appropriate pre- and post-project monitoring be conducted?	
If appropriate, did the proposal include an Alternatives Analysis as a task?	
Were appropriate figures included (Location Map, Site Map/Photos)? Did proposal provide a site plan locating significant existing features at an appropriate scale with an accurate legend?	
Did the BOD provide narrative adequate to determine appropriateness of proposed assessment tasks?	
Is (are) the proposed assessment(s) adequate for the type/location/complexity of proposed restoration?	
Does the design schedule appear to lay out assessments in appropriate order?	
Was a detailed task list included? (e.g., assessment, 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)?	
Is it clear that appropriate professionals will be included on the site	

FY 2017-2018
Wetlands Restoration for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program

Engineering-Geologic Review

assessment and design development team?	
Feasibility	
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/detailed?	
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	