

# 2010 FRGP PSN

## APPENDIX D

### PROPOSAL EVALUATION and SCORING PROTOCOLS

Administrative Review .....	1
FRGP Cost Analysis Evaluation .....	2
FRGP Matching Funds Scoring Matrix.....	3
DFG Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review .....	4
FRGP Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP) .....	5
FRGP Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB), Instream Habitat Restoration (HI), Instream Bank Stabilization (HS).....	6
FRGP Upslope Restoration (HU) .....	7
FRGP Riparian Restoration (HR) .....	8
FRGP Status and Trends (MD).....	9
FRGP Organizational Support (OR).....	10
FRGP Project Design (PD).....	11
FRGP Public Involvement (PI).....	12
FRGP Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, Planning and Restoration Project Planning (PL) .	13
FRGP Fish Screens (SC) .....	14
FRGP Water Conservation Measures (WC) .....	15
FRGP Water Measuring Devices (WD) .....	16
FRGP Water Purchase (WP).....	17
FRGP California Coastal Salmonid Restoration Grants Peer Review Committee (PRC).....	18

## Administrative Review

FRGP staff will conduct an administrative review on all proposals. The administrative review will determine if the proposal package is complete and meets all the requirements for submission in Part II. If the proposal does not pass the administrative review, the proposal will be rejected.

	Yes	No
1. Proposal submitted on time. (All project types.)		
2. FRGP 2010 Application Form was used. (All project types.)		
3. Applicant is a public agency, Indian tribe, or nonprofit organization. (All project types.)		
4. Submitted 28 paper copies and 1 CD. (All project types.)		
5. Proposed project is in the focus. (All 4 criteria have been met.) (All project types.)		
6. Project Description is detailed, not a list of unexplained tasks or activities. (All project types.)		
7. Budget is detailed, without lump sums or lump sums detailed on separate budget. (All project types.)		
8. Design Plans. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HS, HU, SC, WC, WD)		
9. Existing Condition Sketch. (Project Type: PD)		
10. Project Location Topographic Map. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, MD, PD, PL, SC, WC, WD, WP)		
11. Watershed (or County) Map. (Project Types: AC, HU, OR, PD, PI, PL, WD, WP)		
12. Provisional landowner access agreement/Provisional Resolution. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, PD, PL, SC, WC, WD, WP)		
13. Photographs of proposed project site. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HR, HS, PD)		
14. a Fence Maintenance Plan and a Riparian Restoration Plan. (Project Type HR)		
15. Quality Assurance and Quality Control Plan. (Project Type: MD)		

Comments:

## FRGP Cost Analysis Evaluation

Evaluation of project cost analysis will include the following:

- Comparison of wages, equipment rates, material costs, and other project costs for similar completed and proposed project work within similar geographic regions.
- Review of labor costs identified by Department of Industrial Relations General Prevailing Wage Determinations (<http://www.dir.ca.gov/>), Davis-Bacon labor rates (<http://www.access.gpo.gov/davisbacon/>), and recent California Employment Development Department wage data ([www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/?PAGEID=152](http://www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/?PAGEID=152)).
- Review of regional equipment rental cost information (including the most current version of California Department of Transportation's (CalTrans), *Labor Surcharge and Equipment Rental Rates* publication (<http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/construc/equipmnt.html>)).
- Restoration costs, labor requirements, and production rates identified in the *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon*, DFG 2004  
[http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fish/documents/SAL\\_SH/SAL\\_Coho\\_Recovery/ReportToCommission\\_2004/22.I\\_CostAndSocioeconomicImpacts.pdf](http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fish/documents/SAL_SH/SAL_Coho_Recovery/ReportToCommission_2004/22.I_CostAndSocioeconomicImpacts.pdf)

Cost analysis evaluation will consider project logistics (e.g. site remoteness, accessibility, coordination required with multiple land holdings), review of production rates/labor requirements in the regional area, and benefit to the recovery of anadromous salmonids.

## FRGP Matching Funds Scoring Matrix

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Project Type: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

$$\% \text{ Soft Cost Share} = (\text{Soft Matching Funds} / \text{Total Project Cost}) \times 100$$

$$\left( \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{_____}} \right) \times 100 =$$

$$\% \text{ Hard Cost Share} = (\text{Hard Matching Funds} / \text{Total Project Cost}) \times 100$$

$$\left( \frac{\text{_____}}{\text{_____}} \right) \times 100 =$$

### Matching Funds

1. Cost share not suitable: projects, personnel or supplies and equipment previously funded by FRGP, matching funds that will not be confirmed by February 1, 2011.
2. Soft cost share: salaries of permanently funded employees working for the applicant or its partners (i.e. state, federal and local government employees, employees of non-profit organizations, etc.); office space, equipment, and supplies; pre-existing vehicles, administrative overhead; **and** cost share funds that will be confirmed after August 15, 2010 up until February 1, 2011.
3. Hard cost share: all out-of-pocket costs specifically associated with the proposed project (i.e., the cost of subcontractors, fuel, outside printing of educational and outreach materials, riparian plants, equipment, (pro-rated or rental rate), skilled labor, cash, subcontractors, permits, easements, fuel, **and** all non-FRGP grant funds confirmed prior to August 15, 2010).

Cost share scoring matrix from level of soft and hard matching funds and resources:

% Soft Match	% Hard Match										
	90-99 %	80-89 %	70-79 %	60-69 %	50-59 %	40-49 %	30-39 %	20-29 %	10-19 %	5 - 9 %	0 - 4 %
90-99 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
80-89 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
70-79 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5
60-69 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-0.5
50-59 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-1
40-49 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-1.0	-1.5
30-39 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-1.0	-1.5
20-29 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-0.5	-1.5	-1.5
10-19 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5	-1.75
5 - 9 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5	-1.75	-2
0 - 4 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5	-1.75	-2

## DFG Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review

### Fisheries Restoration Grants Program

Fisheries Engineering Program staff: Engineering

Project:	YES	NO	N/A
1. Is the project described thoroughly enough to determine how effectively the project is likely to perform or whether the project is likely to meet the stated goals of the project?			
1. Does the Intermediate or Conceptual Plan Report outline the set of conditions, needs, and requirements taken into account in designing the project and are the plans $\geq 65$ percent plan development for these project categories?  NOTE: If the design plans lack this level of information it should not be considered for funding at this time. See comments below.			
3. Given the background information and/or data available, does the project design match the stated goals?			
4. Does the project team have the experience or compliment of expertise required for project success (e.g., demonstrated experience on similar projects; technical expertise appropriate to the project; communication, coordination and logistical capabilities)?			
5. Has the project proponent participated in technical training that is likely to contribute to project success (e.g., fish passage seminars, hands-on bioengineering or erosion control workshops)?			
6. Is this project likely to require future consultation or evaluation of a conceptual plan as it is being developed (e.g., a fish passage barrier removal project that includes a fish ladder for which only a conceptual plan is provided)?  If YES, is this consultation reflected in the project time line and budget?			
7. Is the project likely to require the participation of a licensed engineer or geologist?  If YES, does the project team include this expertise? Is the licensed professional identified?			
8. Are subcontractors identified?			
9. The proposed project design/plan is lacking vital information and should not be considered for funding at this time. See comments below.			
Comments/Questions:			

## FRGP Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
3. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontractors).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI. Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
6. The project design has been favorably reviewed by a DFG or NOAA Fisheries Hydraulic Engineer and design determined to be appropriate (retrofit projects require field review).	0			-5
7. The proposed project meets DFG and NOAA Fisheries fish passage criteria (see Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX, Appendix A and B). Yes = Unimpeded passage for adults and juveniles; Med = Improves passage but does not meet criteria under some high or low flows; No = Project will not meet fish passage criteria.	0	-1		-5
8. Fish passage assessment (Red, Gray, Green) completed using the protocol in the <i>California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual</i> , Part IX, and barrier determined to be: Yes = Red or Gray; No = Green or No Survey.	0			-5
9. For Gray barriers, extent of barrier to anadromous adults over range of migration flows (% passable per FishXing) Yes = 1-33%; Med = 34-66%; Low = 67-99%; No = unknown.	0	-0.5	-0.75	-1
10. For Gray barriers, extent of barrier to anadromous juveniles over range of migration flows (% passable per FishXing) Yes = 1-33%; Med = 34-66%; Low = 67-99%; No = unknown.	0	-0.5	-0.75	-1
11. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quantity of the habitat upstream of the barrier. Yes = > 1 mile; Med = 1 to 0.5 mile; Low = 0.5 to 0.25 mile; No = < 0.25 (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
12. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality of the habitat upstream of the barrier. Yes = Excellent/Good; Med = Fair; Low = Poor; No = unknown (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX).	0	-0.5	-0.75	-2
13. Documented absence of other downstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers; Yes = no barriers below; Med = barrier below with a plan to identify and treat; Low = partial barrier below with no plan to identify or treat; No = Complete barrier below with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
14. Indicate listing status of salmonid which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
15. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

# FRGP Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB), Instream Habitat Restoration (HI), Instream Bank Stabilization (HS)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Scientific and Technical Review**

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
3. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI, Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
6. Instream limiting factors have been identified within the watershed: (Such as Spawning, Over-winter habitat, Summer Rearing, Escape Cover, Passage, etc) as a priority based in: Yes = complete watershed assessment; Med = habitat inventory report or equivalent; Low = reach level survey; No = no plan/survey.	0	-0.25	-1	-2
7. Extent to which proposed project corrects the problem being addressed. Yes = completely; Med = partially; No = does not.	0	-0.5		-5
<b>For HB Projects</b>				
8. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quantity of the habitat upstream of the barrier. Yes = > 1 mile; Med = 1 to 0.5 mile; Low = 0.5 to 0.25 mile; No = < 0.25.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
9. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality of the habitat upstream of the barrier. Yes = Excellent/Good; Med = Fair; Low = Poor; No = unknown.	0	-0.5	-0.75	-1
10. Documented absence of downstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers; Yes = no barriers below; Med = barrier below with a plan to identify and treat; No = barrier below with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.5		-2
11. Documented absence of upstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers; Yes = no barriers below; Med = barrier below with a plan to identify and treat; No = barrier below with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.25		-0.5
12. The proposed project is: Yes = complete barrier removal, Med = partial removal, Low = modification of stream channel only.	0	-0.5	-1	
<b>Field Level Review – Technique, location, application</b>				
13. The problems have been adequately identified and the techniques proposed are appropriate for the channel type (according to Part III). Yes = all; or No = none.	0			-5
14. The project will utilize DFG acceptable techniques as described in the manual or approved by DFG/NOAA engineers. Yes = described in manual, Med = not in manual but approved by DFG/NOAA engineers, No = not in manual or approved by engineers.	0	-0.5		-5
15. Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type, and species for the stream zone (active channel, floodplain, and upland) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
16. Indicate listing status of salmonid which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
17. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

## FRGP Upslope Restoration (HU)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
3. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
6. If road treatments are proposed, they will reduce sediment delivery to stream channels through; Yes = de-commissioning only; Med = de-commissioning and storm-proofing; Low = storm-proofing only; No = none of the above.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
7. Upslope limiting factors, have been identified within the watershed (Water Quality, Riparian Dysfunction, Excessive Sediment, Spawning gravel quality, etc) as a priority based in: Yes = complete watershed assessment; Med = habitat inventory report or equivalent; Low = reach level survey; No = no plan/survey.	0	-0.25	-1	-2
8. Extent to which the proposed project implements the high and medium priority upslope restoration recommendations from the plan to reduce sediment delivery to the stream for the identified reach/sub-watershed. Yes = >75%; Med = 74-50%; Low = 25-49%; No = <25%.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
9. Extent to which proposed project corrects the problem being addressed. Yes = completely; Med = partially; No = does not.	0	-0.5		-5
<b>Field Level Review – Technique, location, application</b>				
10. The project will utilize DFG acceptable techniques as described in the manual or approved by DFG/NOAA engineers. Yes = described in manual, Med = not in manual but approved by DFG/NOAA engineers, No = not in manual or approved by engineers.	0	-0.5		-5
11. The problems have been adequately identified and the techniques, size and type of materials proposed are appropriate for the watershed/sub watershed/land management area (according to Chapter X). Yes = all; No = none.	0			-5
12. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
13. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_



## FRGP Riparian Restoration (HR)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
3. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI, Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
6. Riparian limiting factors, have been identified within the watershed (Canopy, Riparian Stability, Escape Cover, Complexity, etc) as a priority based in: Yes = complete watershed assessment; Med = habitat inventory report or equivalent; Low = reach level survey; No = no plan/survey.	0	-0.25	-1	-2
7. Extent to which proposed project implements the high and medium priority riparian recommendations from the plan to restore natural function of the riparian corridor for the entire identified reach/sub-watershed: Yes = > 75%; Med = 74-50%; Low 25-49% partial; No < 25%.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
8. Is riparian restoration plan adequate to implement project.	0			-5
<b>Field Level Review – Technique, location, application</b>				
9. The project will utilize DFG acceptable techniques as described in the manual (Part VII and XI).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
10. The plants will be monitored and replanted (if necessary) to achieve the specified standard for success: Yes = 3 years or more; Med = 2 years; Low = 1 year; No = not monitored.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
11. Where necessary to achieve specified standard for success the plants will be maintained including irrigation, weeding, and herbivore protection: Yes = Not necessary to achieve specified standard for success or maintained for 3 years; Med = Maintained for 2 years; Low = Maintained for 1 year; No = Not maintained but maintenance necessary to achieve specified standard for success.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
12. Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type and appropriate successional species for the stream zone (active channel, floodplain and upland) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
13. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
14. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

## FRGP Status and Trends (MD)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. The project monitoring questions, goals, hypotheses and measurable objectives are clearly defined.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI; Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-2	-5
6. The project will employ a suitable, scientifically valid study design, appropriate monitoring parameters, sampling scheme, and analysis.	0	-1	-2	-5
7. The project will utilize protocols approved by FRGP-TRT. Yes = protocols approved by FRGP-TRT; Med = protocols used by other agencies but not by the FRGP; No = not acceptable by FRGP-TRT.	0	-1		-5
8. If extended monitoring is needed the proposal presents a long-term plan with end date.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
9. QA/QC plan adequate to ensure data quality.	0			-2
10. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
11. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

## FRGP Organizational Support (OR)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_ / \_\_\_ / \_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI. Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
5. Proposal will focus attention on a watershed with no previous watershed organizational effort or with a previous inadequate organizational effort.	0			-1
6. Proposal identifies measurable tasks to be accomplished in the watershed to develop and implement plan based restoration projects for anadromous fish or their habitat (i.e., develop watershed plan etc).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
7. Extent to which the proposal demonstrates a willingness and commitment to work with others to achieve the organization's goals and how it might enhance other efforts within the geographic extent of the organization.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
<b>For Existing Groups Only</b>				
8. The proposal contains a status report.	0			-5
9. The status report identifies the group's accomplishments including past FRGP deliverables, outreach success, watershed planning and assessment, habitat restoration implementation, and other DFG objectives.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
10. Past activities have lead to development of a watershed plan. Yes = Plan developed; Med = plan in progress; No = no plan.	0	-1		-2
11. Applicants past activities have lead to plan based implementation projects: Yes = in the last 2 yrs; Med = 2-4 yrs; No = none or > 4 yrs.	0	-1		-5
12. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
13. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

## FRGP Project Design (PD)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. The proposed project would improve, protect, or enhance habitat for anadromous salmonids? Yes = addresses the Key limiting factor, Low = addresses a contributing factor, No = does not address any factors.	0		-2	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
4. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
5. Licensed professional(s) has the expertise as appropriate to the type of project being designed.	0			-5
6. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
7. The proposal identifies all necessary surveys required to complete the design. Yes = identifies all surveys, Low = does not identify 1 or 2 surveys, No = does not identify any surveys.	0		-2	-3
8. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI; Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
9. Degree to which proposed project will develop implementation project(s); Yes = Implementation directly after this project, Med = Proposal is a feasibility study, No = Other project development needed before implementation.	0	-1		-3
10. The proposed deliverables include plans and maps, and will effectively convey limiting factors and prioritized solutions to landowners and other interested people.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
11. Proposal documents sufficient local landowner interest for project implementation after project design is completed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
12. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
13. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

## FRGP Public Involvement (PI)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI, Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
5. Proposal will focus attention on a watershed(s) with no previous watershed organizational or planning effort.	0			-1
6. Proposal identifies measurable tasks to be accomplished in the region's watersheds to address factors limiting anadromous fish or their habitat which directly supports local salmonid habitat restoration and recovery efforts.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
7. Proposal demonstrates the current extent of regional stakeholder support through multiple partnerships and/or non-traditional partnerships.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
8. Extent to which the proposal demonstrates a willingness and commitment to work with others to achieve the organization's goals and how it might enhance other efforts within the geographic extent of the organization.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
9. Degree to which proposal meets recommendations of an established watershed, recovery or planning effort.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
<b>For Existing Groups</b>				
10. The proposal contains a status report.	0			-5
11. The status report identifies the group's accomplishments including past FRGP deliverables, outreach success, watershed planning and assessment, habitat restoration implementation, and other DFG objectives.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
12. Past activities have lead to a regional prioritization plan Yes = 0, Med = regional prioritization planning effort; No = no regional planning effort.	0	-1		-2
13. Applicants past activities have lead to plan based implementation projects: Yes = in the last 2 yrs; Med = 2-4 yrs; No = none or > 4 yrs.	0	-1		-2
14. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
15. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

# FRGP Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, Planning and Restoration Project Planning (PL)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Scientific and Technical Review**

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
3. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
5. Project will utilize DFG acceptable assessment protocols.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
6. If there are significant social issues associated with successful restoration of the watershed, the proposal adequately addresses those issues, or references a prior document adequately addressing those issues.	0			-5
7. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI; Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
8. Extent to which proposed project encompasses or completes an entire watershed or sub-watershed; Yes = 80-100% of the watershed; Med = 70-80% of the watershed; Low = 60-70% of the watershed; No = <50% of the watershed.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
9. Extent to which project will develop complete watershed plan: Yes = Complete watershed plan as described in PSN Part VI; Med = Specific assessment based on DFG-acceptable watershed plan; Low = DFG-acceptable ranch implementation plan; No = Specific assessment not based on previous planning effort.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
10. The proposed deliverables include plans, reports, databases, maps, and outreach efforts and will effectively convey limiting factors and prioritized solutions to landowners and other interested people.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
11. Proposal documents sufficient local landowner interest for plan implementation or a detailed description of how landowner support will be secured.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
12. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
13. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

## FRGP Fish Screens (SC)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Scientific and Technical Review**

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range:5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
3. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI: Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
6. Water right has been determined (documentation provided), flow monitored by a gage at the screen, and diversion will be operated in compliance with water rights regulations.	0			-5
7. Proposed screen meets DFG and NOAA Fisheries screening criteria including structure placement, construction materials, approach velocity, sweeping velocity, cleaning requirements, screen opening, and bypass design.	0			-5
8. Included is a copy of the fee title appropriated or adjudicated water ownership title, deed, or other document that demonstrates the validity of ownership for the water rights being proposed or modified.	0			-5
9. A survey on the target stream substantiates benefit to anadromous salmonids.	0			-1
10. Has fish screen plan been approved by DFG/NOAA engineers.	0			-5
11. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
12. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

## FRGP Water Conservation Measures (WC)

Proposal #: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
3. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI: Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
6. Included is a copy of the fee title appropriated or adjudicated water ownership title, deed, or other document that demonstrates the validity of ownership for the water rights being proposed or modified.	0			-2
7. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality and quantity of the habitat. Yes = Good; Med = Fair; Low = Poor; No = unknown.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
8. Reduced water quality or quantity from water extraction or tailwater documented by, and determined to be, degrading to salmonid habitat by a qualified biologist/hydrologist.	0			-2
9. Water saved or returned to the stream from the project will be available during the times of year when it will provide the greatest benefit to salmonid habitat. Yes = provides greatest benefit to salmonids, Med = provides some benefit to salmonids, No = provides no benefit to salmonids.	0	-1		-2
10. Water losses and potential savings realized through project implementation, identified by a qualified hydrologist.	0			-2
11. Project or diversion will be implemented and operated using BMP's approved by DFG and/or NOAA Fisheries and in compliance with water rights regulations.	0			-2
12. Project will reduce tail water generation through improved irrigation systems or assist in recovery and reuse of tail water, to prevent discharge of tail water to stream.. (Not applicable = Yes.)	0			-2
13. Tail water system protected from storm/high water events.	0			-1
14. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
15. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_



## FRGP Water Measuring Devices (WD)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
3. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including sub-contracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Proposal includes information required in PSN Part VI; Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
6. Reduced water quality and/or quantity from water extraction documented by a qualified hydrologist and determined to be degrading to salmonid habitat by a qualified biologist, or the intent of the water measuring device is to help manage water diversions in order to avoid or minimize impacts to fisheries.	0			-5
7. Instream gauges positioned to track mainstem flow as well as tributaries that contribute flow for fish recovery.	0			-1
8. Gauge installed in support of salmonid recovery actions.	0			-5
9. An operation/maintenance agreement defining who keeps a weir or gauge operating during the timeframe of the proposal is included.	0			-2
10. Will the gauge be operated and maintained past the expiration of this proposals?	0			-1
11. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
12. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

## FRGP Water Purchase (WP)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_/\_\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

### Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 5 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	Med	Low	No
1. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement.	0	-1	-2	-5
2. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
3. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including sub-contracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
4. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Proof of the owner's willingness to sell provided.	0			-5
6. Included is a copy of the fee title appropriated or adjudicated water ownership title, deed, or other document that demonstrates the validity of ownership for the water rights being proposed; and a valuation, including a description of the basis for that valuation.	0			-5
7. An appraisal is included.	0			-5
8. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality and quantity of the habitat. Yes = Good; Med = Fair; Low = Poor; No = unknown.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
9. Water saved or returned to the stream from the project will be available during the times of year when it will provide the greatest benefit to salmonid habitat. Yes = provides greatest benefit to salmonids, Med = provides some benefit to salmonids, No = provides no benefit to salmonids.	0	-1		-2
10. Proposal describes who will manage the acquisition, how the acquisition will be managed, and how the water rights purchase, lease, or easement will protect and enhance salmon habitat.	0			-1
11. Included is a narrative describing current use, diversion, basis for determining the amount of flow available, how the proposed additional flow will be measured, who will hold and monitor the water rights purchase or lease, who will establish baseline information, and who will maintain monitoring records. Any facilities that may require removal or renovation for flows to enter the stream are described.	0			-1
12. Included is a survey of surrounding landowners and downstream users and a narrative describing how the water rights purchase or lease will impact downstream users, and how surrounding land use and downstream impacts will be mitigated. Also include are any rights or claims downstream users may have to flow. If proposal is based on cooperative lease or purchase agreements, a list of cooperators is provided.	0			-1
13. Indicate listing status of salmonids which will benefit from the project. Yes = Endangered, No = Threatened.	0			-0.5
14. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): \_\_\_\_\_

# FRGP California Coastal Salmonid Restoration Grants Peer Review Committee (PRC)

Proposal#: \_\_\_\_\_ Region: \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_/\_\_\_/\_\_\_

Proposal Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**PRC Review**

The PRC evaluates and scores each proposal based on the following criteria. Each criterion below is worth a maximum of one point. Points are added to achieve a final score. Maximum final score is 5, lowest score is 0.

Criteria	Maximum score of 1 point (fractions allowed)	
<b>1. Benefit to Species.</b> The proposal addresses a recovery or restoration need documented for the target species, age-class, and location (site, reach, watershed, and/or population) and the beneficial response of fish will be maintained over a reasonable if not permanent duration.		
<b>2. Technical Merit.</b> The write-up is sufficient for reviewers to fully understand and evaluate the technical merits of the project (project plans, designs with specific sites, activities identified). Objectives, approach, and scope of work are clear and technically sound; the project both feasible and appropriate for the site and can be completed on schedule given reasonably foreseeable constraints (weather conditions, planting seasons, operational conditions).		
<b>3. Cost Effectiveness.</b> The budget details identify unit costs, hourly rates, and line items, administrative overhead does not exceed a total 15% percent, and the project is cost effective (total cost, market rate). The proposal identifies cost share source(s) (federal, state, other), type (cash, in-kind), the status of the match (secured, pending [if pending, the date a decision is expected to be made]), and the dollar amount/percent share of total cost.		
<b>4. Community and Partner Involvement.</b> There is demonstrated local area stakeholder support for the project (number, diversity of partners, contact information/letters demonstrating involvement). The project will be coordinated with local agencies and stakeholders.		
<b>5. Organization Qualifications.</b> The project manager, principal investigator(s), and other key personnel have experience and expertise required for the project, and individual roles and responsibilities are well defined and appropriate. The proposal demonstrates relevant field experience, completed projects, published reports, or other materials. When necessary, licensed professionals are identified for design, construction, or oversight of on-the-ground activities. Subcontractor selection and roles are clearly explained and justified.		
<b>Total Score</b>		
<i><b>This PSN gives preference to proposals which benefit Federally Listed Endangered salmonids over proposals which benefit Federally Listed Threatened salmonids. Proposals which benefit Threatened salmonids will have 0.5 point deducted from their overall score, Endangered salmonids will not.</b></i>	<b>Endangered</b>	<b>Threatened</b>
	<b>-0</b>	<b>-0.5</b>

Comments: