

CDFW Proposition 1 & Proposition 68 Grant Programs - 2020

Delta Scientific Studies Applications

Technical Review Criteria Details

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

Scoring Criteria

Question Number	CRITERIA DESCRIPTION	Weight	POINTS POSSIBLE
1	<p>Importance/Relevance: Relevance to Solicitation focus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent does the proposed work address the science focus areas identified? 	2	10
2	<p>Importance/Relevance: Applicability to Delta Resource Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the information produced by the proposed work be relevant and useful to resource managers and policy-makers; inform water and natural resource policy; and inform restoration and management decisions in the Delta? Does the proposed work have a high potential to address critical management issues in the Delta? Does the proposed work have significance at the landscape and regional scale? Will the information produced contribute to effective adaptive management and co-production of science for the Delta? 	2	10
3	<p>Scientific Merit - Justification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposal adequately describe the project purpose and justify the project need, considering relevant existing knowledge? 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/or questions clearly stated and internally consistent? Does the proposed work address key scientific uncertainties and fill important information gaps? 	2	10
4	<p>Scientific Merit – Collaboration and Integration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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)? Does the work propose integration across and collaboration between fields? 	2	10

Question Number	CRITERIA DESCRIPTION	Weight	POINTS POSSIBLE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposed work leverage and integrate existing data, existing modeling efforts, and/or existing programs? • Does the proposed work demonstrate innovation and appropriate use of emerging technologies? 		
5	<p>Approach and Feasibility: Study Design and Methods</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposed work 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? • Is there adequate description of the means by which each element of the project will be implemented (e.g., methods/techniques used, materials and equipment used)? • Are the methods, including data analysis, clearly linked to the proposed hypotheses and/or research questions? 	2	10
6	<p>Approach and Feasibility: Logistics</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are responsible parties identified for each project element? • Are the tasks identified appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project? • Is the Scope of Work sufficiently detailed to serve as a statement of work for the project? 	1	5
7	<p>Schedule and Deliverables: Timeline</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the schedule demonstrate a logical sequence and timing of project tasks? • Is it feasible to complete the proposed work within the proposed time frame? • Do the tasks in the schedule align with the tasks in the Approach and Scope of Work and Timeline? 	1	5
8	<p>Schedule and Deliverables: Publications and Deliverables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposed work have reasonable milestones and appropriate deliverables? • Is there a plan for widespread and effective dissemination of information to scientists, managers, and the broader stakeholder community gained from the project? • Will the data be made easily available to the public? • Will the proposed work produce at least one scientific manuscript for publication during the term of the grant agreement or contract? • Is there a plan to make the information directly available to the entities that will most benefit from it? • Will proposed work produce open source tools? 	1	5
9	<p>Data Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposal contain a detailed data management plan for the proposed project that adequately addresses all sections described in the DMP guidance document? 	1	5

Question Number	CRITERIA DESCRIPTION	Weight	POINTS POSSIBLE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will the data be made easily available to the public? • Is there a plan to make the information directly available to the entities that will most benefit from it? • Will proposed work produce open source tools? 		
10	<p>Project Team Qualifications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the project team have the appropriate experience and expertise to complete the proposed work? • Where applicable, do the PI and project team have experience coordinating and leading a multi-team effort? • What is the project team’s track record for publication, productivity, management engagement, and broader outreach? • Are the necessary facilities, equipment, and administrative capacity available to successfully perform and manage the proposed tasks? 	2	10
11	<p>Stakeholder Support & Outreach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the proposal indicate support from a diversity of stakeholders, including under-represented groups? • How well does the proposed work incorporate opportunities for stakeholder input? • How well does the proposed work incorporate public outreach or public education? • How well does the proposed work support students and/or post-docs, training and mentoring of junior staff and early career scientists? 	1	5
12	<p>Applicant Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the budget reasonable and appropriate for this kind of work? 	1	5
13	<p>Budget Justification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there sufficient support for all costs in the Budget? • Does the justification provide rationale for unspecified cost estimates (e.g., budgets for subcontractors not yet identified) • Are Tasks shown in the budget justification consistent with the tasks shown in the approach, scope of work, and schedule of deliverables? 	1	5
14	<p>Cost Share</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • To what extent does the project provide secured federal, State, private, or local cost share? Cost share includes cash and in-kind services. 	1	5

Question Number	CRITERIA DESCRIPTION	Weight	POINTS POSSIBLE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does proposal document that secured cost share will be spent between a year before the anticipated award date (March 2020) and the end of the proposed grant agreement (March 2024)? 		
15	Strengths <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize the strengths identified in the review. 	0	0
16	Weaknesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarize the weaknesses identified in the review. 	0	0
17	Red Flags <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify critical issues that the program Selection Panel should be aware of, and items that should be addressed if the project is selected for funding. 	0	0
	TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS		100