

CDFW Cannabis Restoration Grant Program – 2021 Qualified Cultivator Funding Opportunity, Technical Review Criteria Details

The following provides more detail on how each criterion listed in Table 3 of the Qualified Cultivator Funding Opportunity Solicitation (Solicitation), will be evaluated during the technical review process.

1. Purpose and Background

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

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- a. Does the proposal describe the project purpose and justify the project need?
- b. Does the proposal describe project background, history, work completed to date, relationship to other projects, and strategy for completion of future phases? What would happen to the project if no funds were available from CDFW? If the project is not implemented soon, what project opportunities or benefits could be lost and why?
- c. 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?
- d. Are the project location and boundaries clearly delineated? Do the maps have the required information?
- e. Does the application sufficiently describe landscape-scale significance of the project?

If you feel the project does not address one or more of the Solicitation's priorities, please note in comments as a red flag with a reason.

2. Solicitation Priorities

Weight: 3, i.e., 15 points maximum

Scoring:

- 5 points: The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Additionally, the project is identified as a [Cannabis Priority Watershed](#) and/or identified as a priority stream in the California Water Action Plan and the identified qualified cultivator(s) has ownership and/or financial interest in no more than 10,000 square feet of total canopy.
- 4 points: The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. The identified qualified cultivator(s) has ownership and/or financial interest in no more than 10,000 square feet of total canopy. However, the project is not identified as a [Cannabis Priority Watershed](#) and/or identified as a priority stream in the California Water Action Plan.
- 3 points: The criterion is fully addressed and is supported by thorough and well-presented documentation and logical rationale. Additionally, the project is identified as a [Cannabis Priority Watershed](#) and/or identified as a priority stream in the California Water Action Plan, but the identified qualified

cultivator(s) has ownership and/or financial interest in 10,000-20,000 square feet of total canopy.

2 points: The criterion is moderately addressed, or the documentation or rationale is incomplete or insufficient. Additionally, the project is not identified as a [Cannabis Priority Watershed](#) and/or identified as a priority stream in the California Water Action Plan, and the identified qualified cultivator(s) has ownership and/or financial interest in 10,000-20,000 square feet of total canopy.

1 point: The criterion is minimally addressed, or no documentation or rationale is presented, the project is not identified as a [Cannabis Priority Watershed](#) and/or identified as a priority stream in the California Water Action Plan.

0 points: criterion is not addressed.

Evaluation Guidance:

- a. Does the proposal address the Solicitation's priorities?
- b. Are the co-benefits and (qualitative or quantitative) assessment methodologies sufficiently described?
- c. 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?
- d. Are the goals, objectives, hypotheses, and questions clearly stated and internally consistent?
- e. Is the project location accurately described within a Cannabis Priority Watershed and/or the California Water Action Plan.
- f. Does the qualified cultivator have ownership and/or financial interest in <10,000 square feet or 10,000-20,000 square feet of total canopy?

If you feel the project does not address one or more of the Solicitation's priorities, please note in comments as a red flag with a reason.

3. Significance of Benefits

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

Scoring:

5 points: Likely to provide multiple benefits that are highly significant and are supported by thorough and well-presented documentation.

4 points: Likely to provide multiple benefits that are highly significant, but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking.

3 points: Likely to provide multiple benefits that are of a moderate level of significance and are supported by thorough and well-presented documentation.

2 points: Likely to provide multiple benefits that are of a moderate level of significance, but the quality of the supporting documentation is lacking.

1 point: Likely to provide a low level of multiple benefits or lack adequate support for benefits claimed.

0 points: Does not provide apparent benefit.

Evaluation Guidance:

- a. Does the proposal provide analysis and documentation to demonstrate the likelihood that the project will provide multiple benefits?

- b. Are the benefits likely to be significant?
- c. Are the anticipated outcomes measurable and quantifiable?

Examples of potential ecosystem benefits include:

- (i) Improvement of water quality
- (ii) Expanded environmental stewardship
- (iii) Protect or increase habitat for native species
- (iv) Protect strategically important lands within watersheds
- (v) Reduce stressors on native species

4. Community Support, Collaboration, and Equity

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

Scoring:

- 5 points: Wide support at the local, regional, and/or larger scale. Multiple stakeholders, community supporters, and part of an equity program.
- 4 points: Support at the local, regional, and/or larger scale. Stakeholders, community supporters, and part of an equity program.
- 3 points: Support at the local, regional, and/or larger scale. Stakeholders, community supporters, and not part of an equity program.
- 1 to 2 points: Limited support at the local, regional, and/or larger scale. Limited stakeholders, community supporters, and not part of an equity program.
- 0 points: No support at the local, regional, and/or larger scale. No stakeholders, community supporters, and not part of an equity program.

Evaluation Guidance:

- a. Does the project have public and institutional support at the local, regional, or larger scale? This may include collaborators, partners, elected officials, supporters, other granting organizations, and engaged stakeholders.
- b. Does the proposal demonstrate that the community is engaged in the project by providing funds, in-kind contributions (e.g., administrative/ technical services, labor, materials, equipment), partnerships, or other evidence of support? Note: Letters of Support are optional.
- c. Does the project history or proposed scope of work include efforts to involve stakeholders in project planning, design, outreach/education, implementation, monitoring, and maintenance?
- d. Is the Project Team partnered with collaborative workgroups or initiatives?
- e. Is the Project Team part of or working with those part of an equity program?

5. Project Team Qualifications

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

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- a. How well does the proposal demonstrate that the project team has the appropriate experience, facilities, equipment, and capacity to successfully perform the proposed tasks?
- b. Where applicable, does project design include a licensed professional in the project team or provide justification for why the services of such a licensed

- professional are not necessary?
- c. How well does the proposal demonstrate appropriate or necessary partnerships to complete the project?

Note: If the subcontractors have not been named, but the Applicant describes the qualities of the desired subcontractors, do not subtract points.

6. Environmental Compliance

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

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- a. Are all applicable State, federal, and local environmental permits for the project identified and their status listed?
- b. Are all necessary and applicable fields completed (e.g. name of lead agency)
- c. For implementation projects, are all permits and processes listed that are required for the proposal, even if you are not requesting CDFW CRGP funds to prepare them?
- d. For planning projects, are all permits for which funding is requested included? This should also include permits anticipated for application during future implementation phase, if that information is available.

7. Monitoring and Reporting

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

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

Planning Projects:

- a. Does the proposal contain a reasonable description of baseline monitoring that would be or has already been conducted?
- b. Does the proposal identify how and when a monitoring plan will be developed to support future effectiveness monitoring?

Implementation Projects:

- a. Does the project's Monitoring and Reporting Plan demonstrate a clear and reasonable approach consistent with the project's objectives?
- b. Are the performance measures appropriate and adequate to demonstrate the project's outcomes?
- c. Does the proposal leverage existing monitoring efforts or produce data that can be readily integrated with such efforts, where applicable/feasible? For example, if the project includes riparian or other wetland restoration: does the monitoring plan include Level 2 (standardized rapid assessment, e.g. CRAM) monitoring?
- d. Does the proposal contain a description of baseline monitoring that would be or has been conducted?
- e. How well does the proposal demonstrate how data and other information generated by the project will be handled, stored, transmitted, and made available to CDFW and the public?
- f. Where applicable, how well do proposed data management activities

incorporate CDFW Minimum Data Standards, and address the specific requirements identified in the Solicitation Section 4.16, Data Management (e.g. BIOS, CEDEN, EcoAtlas)?

8. Durability of Investment & Long-term Management

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

Planning Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Planning Evaluation Guidance:

- a. 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)?
- b. Is future implementation likely to proceed and yield the stated natural resource benefits?

Implementation Scoring:

- 5 points: Provides a well-defined long-term management and maintenance strategy; includes documentation of protection in perpetuity, and has documentation of land tenure for at least five years, if project is on private property.
- 4 points: Provides a well-defined long-term management and maintenance strategy for a minimum of five years, and has documentation of land tenure for at least five years, if project is on private property.
- 3 points: Provides a less-than-well-defined long-term management and maintenance strategy for a minimum of five years, and has documentation of land tenure for at least five years, if project is on private property.
- 1 to 2 points: Provides a less-than-well-defined long-term management and maintenance strategy for less than five years, and documentation of land tenure less than five years, if project is on private property.
- 0 points: Provides an inadequate long-term management and maintenance strategy and no documentation of land tenure, if project is on private property.

Implementation Evaluation Guidance:

- a. Does the project describe steps needed to deliver and sustain beneficial outcomes in the long-term?
- b. How well does the applicant explain plans for long-term management and sustainability beyond the term of the grant agreement?
- c. Does the applicant demonstrate tenure to and control of the project site to be restored for at least five years, or document the intent to obtain adequate land tenure, if project is on private property?

9. Timeline and Deliverables

Weight: 3, i.e., 15 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- a. Does the schedule demonstrate a logical sequence and timing of project tasks?
- b. Does the project have reasonable milestones and appropriate deliverables?

- c. Do the tasks in the schedule align with the tasks in the Approach and Scope of Work?

10. Approach and Scope

Weight: 3, i.e., 15 points maximum

Scoring: Standard Scoring Criteria

Evaluation Guidance:

- a. Is there adequate description of the responsible parties and means by which each element of the project will be implemented (e.g., methods/techniques used, materials and equipment used)?
- b. Is the proposal's Approach and Scope of Work sufficiently detailed to serve as a statement of work for a grant agreement?
- c. Is the approach well designed and does it include tasks appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?
- d. Is the project technically feasible from a biological and engineering perspective?
- e. Is it feasible to complete the project within the term of the grant agreement?
- f. Does the project 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?

11. Applicant Budget and Justification

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

Scoring:

5 points: Budget (including Subcontractor Budget) is detailed and accurate.

3 to 4 points: Budget (including Subcontractor Budget) contains moderate detail, limited inaccuracies, or unspecified lump sums of up to 20 percent of the total Budget.

1 to 2 points: Budget (including Subcontractor Budget) lacks sufficient detail, includes; many inaccuracies, unspecified lump sums of 20 to 50 percent of the total Budget, or inappropriate costs/indirect charge rate.

0 points: Budget (including Subcontractor Budget) lacks sufficient detail, is inaccurate, or contains unspecified lump sums exceeding 50 percent of the total Budget.

Evaluation Guidance:

- a. Does the proposed Applicant Budget accurately detail all CDFW requested costs?
- b. To what extent does the budget avoid use of unspecified lump sums and exclude ineligible costs?
- c. Are costs appropriate for this kind of work?
- d. Is the proposed Budget Justification appropriate for the work proposed and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs by task (for both CDFW requested cost and cost share)?
- e. Are tasks shown in the Budget Justification consistent with the tasks shown in the Approach and Scope of Work and Timeline?

f. If applicable, is the attached Subcontractor Budget accurate?

Note: If Subcontractor has not yet been identified, do not subtract points for lack of detail in the Subcontractor budget.

12. Cost Share

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

Scoring:

5 points: Cost share of >40%

4 points: Cost share of 31-40%

3 points: Cost share of 21-30%

2 points: Cost share of 11-20%

1 point: Cost share of 1-10%

0 points: Cost share of 0%

Overall Evaluation

1. Strengths

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

2. Weaknesses

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

3. Red Flags

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