

FRGP 2010 Migration 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) and Fish Ladders (FL)..... | 5 |
| FRGP Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB)..... | 6 |
| FRGP Project Design (PD)..... | 7 |
| FRGP Fish Screens (SC) | 8 |

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 Migration 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: FL, FP, HB, SC) | | |
| 9. Existing Condition Sketch. (Project Type: PD) | | |
| 10. Project Location Topographic Map. (Project Types: FL, FP, HB, PD, SC) | | |
| 11. Watershed (or County) Map. (Project Types: PD) | | |
| 12. Provisional landowner access agreement/Provisional Resolution. (Project Types: FL, FP, HB, PD, SC) | | |
| 13. Photographs of proposed project site. (Project Types: FL, FP, HB, PD) | | |

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).
- 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

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, 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 ≥ 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) and Fish Ladders (FL)

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. For FL projects: 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 |
| 16. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix). | | | | |

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB)

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 |
| 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 | |
| Field Level Review – Technique, location, application | | | | |
| 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 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 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 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) | |
|---|--|-------------------|
| 1. Benefit to Species. 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. | | |
| 2. Technical Merit. 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). | | |
| 3. Cost Effectiveness. 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. | | |
| 4. Community and Partner Involvement. 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. | | |
| 5. Organization Qualifications. 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. | | |
| Total Score | | |
| <i>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.</i> | Endangered | Threatened |
| | -0 | -0.5 |

Comments: