# CDFW Proposition 1 Grant Program – 2021 North Coast Coho Recovery Applications Technical Review Criteria Details

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

1. **Project Team Qualifications**

Weight: 1, i.e., 5 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

* 1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the listed senior staff/subcontractor(s) have the appropriate experience, facilities, equipment, and capacity to successfully complete the proposed project? If a subcontractor has yet to be selected for a certain activity, does the proposal provide sufficient detail in the desired experience/qualifications of subcontractor?
	2. If applicable, do the project design activities include a licensed professional in the project team or provide justification for why the services of such a licensed professional are not necessary?
1. **Consistency with Plans**

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

1. Does the proposal adequately establish that the proposed project is consistent with, and demonstrate the implementation of, one or more of the Plans that the applicant selected? At a minimum, the CWAP and one or more of the coho recovery plans specific to this Solicitation should be discussed. For the coho recovery plans, the proposal should either:
* Tie the project to a specific action called out in the plan (proposal should include a page reference and reviewer should verify that the project is listed [full points]); or
* Explain how the project would address the threats and limiting factors identified in the plan [points should be based on how well the proposal explains plan consistency].
1. **Location Information / Land Tenure**

Weight: 1, i.e., 5 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

* 1. Are the location attachments (attachments 3 to 7) adequate and complete? Do the maps have the required information for the reviewer to get a general reference of the proposed project? Are the project location(s) and boundaries clearly delineated?
1. Specific to the project type (planning / implementation / acquisition), is Land Tenure adequately addressed?
* For a proposed implementation or acquisition project, does the proposal demonstrate (1) access to, and (2) control of the project site(s) for at least 25 years, or does the proposal make a reasonable case that a less-than-25-year timeline is appropriate?
* For a planning project with on the ground activities, does the proposal demonstrate adequate access to conduct any necessary baseline surveys for at least the duration of the proposed term?

If Land Tenure is not adequately addressed, please note in the “red flags” section.

1. **Climate Change**

Weight: 1, i.e., 5 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

* 1. Does the proposal demonstrate that the proposed project will provide resilience and/or adaptations to local climate change stressors?
	2. Based on the stressors selected and described by the proposal, is it likely that the proposed project will help address/mitigate/adapt to the effects of climate change at a significant scale within the proposed project’s watershed? For planning proposals consider the project once physically completed.
1. **Goals, Objectives & Performance Measures**

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

* 1. Are the project’s goals and objectives clearly articulated and realistic?
	2. Do the performance measures explain how success of the goals and objectives will be assessed?
	3. Is it likely that each goal will be accomplished based on the listed objective(s)?
	4. Do the goals and objectives demonstrate that the proposed project will have multiple environmental benefits or at least one benefit of significant magnitude at the watershed scale?
1. **Monitoring and Long-term Management**

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

* 1. Do the monitoring metrics explain how success of the goals and objectives will be documented? Is it clear what will be monitored and the methods that will be used?
1. Is the monitoring timeline adequately described? Does the proposal identify a timeline for completing baseline and/or post-project monitoring?
2. Does the proposal demonstrate coordination with existing monitoring efforts, or is it likely to produce data that can be readily integrated with such efforts, where applicable/feasible?
3. Does the proposal contain a description of baseline monitoring that will be, or has been, conducted?
4. How well does the proposal explain plans for long-term management and sustainability beyond the term of the grant agreement?
5. **Deliverables and Timeline**

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

* 1. Does the proposal’s schedule demonstrate a logical sequencing and timing?
	2. Does the proposal estimate realistic and achievable completion dates for each task/subtask?
	3. Does the proposal have practical milestones and/or appropriate deliverables?
	4. Does the proposal list at least one deliverable for each task/subtask?
	5. Do the tasks in the schedule align and have a similar order with the tasks in the Scope of Work?
1. **Applicant Budget**

Weight: 1, i.e., 5 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

1. Does the proposal list all costs necessary to demonstrate the project can be satisfactorily completed?
2. Are the amounts in the budget accurately entered and consistent with Attachment 17 Budget Tables?
3. If applicable, is the value for staff benefits reasonable and are indirect charges within the specified threshold of 20%?
4. **Budget Justification**

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

* 1. Does the proposal fully support and justify all grant funded amounts?
	2. Does the proposal use accurate and reasonable assessments, such as documented estimates and/or logical calculation formulas, to determine the proposed project’s costs? Large lump sums (e.g., exceeding 10% of the total budget) with no itemization or justification of cost assumptions should be noted in the red flags section.
	3. If applicable, are attached subcontractor estimates accurate and reasonable, as well? (Note: If a subcontractor has not yet been selected, do not subtract points for lack of detail.)
	4. Does the Budget Justification section specify the task for each line-item and are tasks consistent with the Scope of Work?
1. **Community Support**

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

1. Does the proposal demonstrate a history of strong, diverse and enduring community support with stakeholder groups and/or leaders at the local, regional, State and/or the federal level?
2. Does the proposed project include match and/or in-kind contributions from stakeholders other than from the applicant exceeding ~25% of the requested grant amount?
3. Does the proposal demonstrate past stakeholder involvement in project design and decision-making? If not, does the proposal include tasks in the Scope of Work to involve stakeholders in project planning, design, implementation, monitoring, and/or maintenance?
4. Does the proposal demonstrate past outreach or education efforts related to the project? If not, does the Scope of Work include an outreach/education element?
5. **Purpose, Need and Background**

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

* 1. Does the proposal clearly and thoroughly describe expected ecological benefits and the likelihood that those benefits will be realized?
	2. Is the underlying scientific basis for the proposed project clearly explained? If applicable, does it include a clearly articulated conceptual model? Is the project design based on the best available science?
	3. Does the proposal clearly and thoroughly describe the proposed project’s background, history, work completed to date, relationship to other projects, and strategy for completion of future phases?
	4. Does the proposal address what would happen to the proposed project if no immediate Prop 1 funds were available?
	5. Does the proposal clearly and thoroughly describe the watershed-scale significance of the proposed project?
1. **Approach, Feasibility, and Scope**

Weight: 2, i.e., 10 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

* 1. Are the tasks described in the proposal's Scope of Work thorough, well-designed, well-ordered, complete, and detailed enough to demonstrate confidence that the proposed project can be satisfactorily completed?
	2. Collectively, will the activities in the Scope of Work achieve the stated goals and objectives of the proposed project?
	3. Collectively, will the activities in the Scope of Work address the purpose and need of the proposed project? In other words, does the proposal demonstrate that restoration is important at this location and that the project design addresses restoration needs?
	4. Based on detail in the Scope of Work, is the proposed project technically feasible from a biological and engineering perspective?
	5. Is it likely that all the activities described in the Scope of Work can be completed within the specified term?

For planning projects:

* 1. Will the project advance planning towards a specific future on-the-ground project (i.e., will it advance the project to a shovel-ready stage that qualifies for future implementation funding)?
	2. Is future implementation likely to proceed and yield the stated natural resource benefits?

**Overall Evaluation**

1. **Strengths**

 Instructions:Identify key strengths and successful outcomes likely to be realized.

1. **Weaknesses**

Instructions: Identify key deficiencies and outcomes that are unlikely to be realized. Describe opportunities to strengthen the proposal.

1. **Red Flags**

Instructions**:** Identify significant issues that should be considered by the Selection Panel or should be addressed by the grant manager (if awarded).