# Priority 2 and 3 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 |  |
| Project Team’s past planned, informed, prioritized or provided tools to implement restoration |  |
| Landowner collaboration or support is demonstrated |  |
| Project Information(max 10 pts) | Project Information complete, clear, and detailed |  |  |  |
| Supplementary Documents conform |  |
| Evaluation Plan or Status Report is complete |  |
| Supports CA Water Action Plan or CA Climate Strategy (WD only) |  |
| Coordination with State Water Board (PL only) |  |
| 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 for planning, outreach, or education |  |  |  |
| Project is prioritized through Focus Table |  |
| Supports projects that target 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 |  |  |  |
| Approach is clear and appropriate |  |
| Deliverables, sequencing, timing are appropriate |  |
| CDFW Manual or approved guidelines used |  |
| Benefits(max 25 pts) | Plans, informs, prioritizes, or provides tools |  |  |  |
| Supports actions contributing to focus species recovery |  |
| Incorporates concepts of ecosystem processes |  |
| Addresses effects of climate change  |  |
| Total Score |  |  |

Additional Comments: