# Priority 1 Project Types Scoresheet

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Region | Review Date | TRT Reviewer | Proposal No. | Proposal Name | Project Types |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

A proposal will score 100 points if maximum Points are given for each Criteria. A reviewer will use the FRGP Guidelines, Scoresheet Instructions and their individual knowledge and experience to determine a Tier (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each Scoring Consideration. Each Tier has a range of points, including Do Not Fund (DNF), as seen on the Scoresheet Instructions. Within a given Tier, a reviewer has flexibility in assigning a score between the minimum and maximum based on the degree to which the proposed project satisfies the Scoring Considerations. The score for any Criteria is determined by the lowest Tier given to any Scoring Consideration. For example, if one of the Scoring Considerations for Budget falls into Tier 2, the Points awarded for that Criteria cannot be lower than 3 points or higher than 6 points, even if all other Scoring Considerations fall into Tier 1 (See Scoring Instructions for Scoring Tiers). Use the Score Justification box to provide comments related to the points awarded for each Criteria per the Scoring Considerations. For Scoring Considerations not applicable to a proposal, indicate “N/A” in place of a Tier number. If any Scoring Consideration receives a DNF, the proposal receives a DNF.

| **Criteria** | **Scoring Considerations** | **Tier** | **Points** | **Score Justification** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Qualifications  (max 10 pts) | Project Team demonstrated past performance |  |  |  |
| Subcontractor selection is clear |  |
| Past deliverables have conformed |  |
| Qualifications and licenses are appropriate |  |
| Landowners’ support is demonstrated |  |
| Project Information  (max 10 pts) | Project Information is complete, clear, and detailed |  |  |  |
| Supplementary Documents conform to Guidelines |  |
| Post-project data collection plan is clear and reasonable |  |
| Budget  (max 10 pts) | Cost-Effectiveness of Project |  |  |  |
| Cost-Effectiveness of Line-items |  |
| Project costs are clearly described |  |
| Applicant and Subcontractor budgets are clear and detailed |  |
| Expenses are justified and allowable |  |
| Cost Share  (max 10 pts) | Total Cost Share (TCS) = (HCS) + (0.5)(SCS)  Total Cost Share Percentage (**TCS%**) = (TCS/TPC)(100) | |  |  |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | TCS% | 40+ | 36-39 | 32-35 | 28-31 | 24-27 | 20-23 | 16-19 | 12-15 | 8-11 | 4-7 | 0-3 | | Points | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Project Need  (max 20 pts) | Habitat degradation root cause detailed and need demonstrated |  |  |  |
| Project is prioritized through Focus Table |  |
| Targets priority habitat features, types, and conditions |  |
| Project is guided by recommendations cited in FRGP Focus Tools to address limiting factors |  |
| Approach  (max 15 pts) | Goals and Objectives address limiting factors |  |  |  |
| Durable, persistent, maintenance free |  |
| Maintenance or monitoring plan ensures longevity |  |
| Deliverables, sequencing, timing, methods, techniques, and materials appropriate |  |
| Protocols used are described in CDFW Manual or approved guidelines |  |
| Addressed all available opportunities within the treatment area |  |
| Benefits  (max 25 pts) | Habitat gains will be significant |  |  |  |
| Contributes to focus species recovery |  |
| Restoration of stream ecosystem processes |  |
| Addresses effects of climate change |  |
| **Total Score:** | | |  |  |

Additional Comments: