

2011 FRGP 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 Americorps (AC).....	5
FRGP Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP)	6
FRGP Habitat Acquisition and Conservation Easements (HA).....	7
FRGP Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB), Instream Habitat Restoration (HI), Instream Bank Stabilization (HS).....	8
FRGP Riparian Restoration (HR)	9
FRGP Upslope Restoration (HU)	10
FRGP Status and Trends (MD) and Monitoring Watershed Restoration (MO).....	11
FRGP Organizational Support (OR).....	12
FRGP Project Design (PD).....	13
FRGP Public Involvement (PI).....	14
FRGP Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, Planning and Restoration Project Planning (PL) .	15
FRGP Cooperative Rearing (RE).....	16
FRGP Fish Screens (SC)	17
FRGP Private Sector Technical Training and Education Project Grants (TE)	18
FRGP Water Conservation Measures (WC)	19
FRGP Water Measuring Devices (WD)	20
FRGP Water Purchase (WP).....	21
FRGP California Coastal Salmonid Restoration Grants Peer Review Committee (PRC).....	22

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 not be considered further for funding this year.

	Yes	No
1. Proposal submitted by the 2011 PSN deadline (March 15, 2011, by 3 PM). (All project types.)		
2. FRGP 2011 Application Form was used. (All project types.)		
3. Applicant is a public agency, Indian tribe, or certified nonprofit organization. (All project types.)		
4. Submitted 5 paper copies and 1 CD. (All project types.)		
5. Proposed project is in the 2011 PSN focus. (All project types.)	Species criteria	
	Geographic criteria	
	Project type criteria	
	Recovery criteria	
6. Project Description is sufficiently detailed as described in Part IV of the 2011 PSN. (All project types.)		
7. Budget is sufficiently detailed, a) without lump sums or b) lump sums detailed on separate budget; as described in Part IV and Part VII of the 2011 PSN. (All project types.)		
8. Design Plans included. (Project Types: FP, HB, HI, HS, HU, SC, WC, WD)		
9. Existing Condition Sketch included. (Project Type: PD)		
10. Project Location Topographic Map included. (Project Types: All project types except AC)		
11. Watershed (or County) Map included. (Project Types: AC, HA, HU, MD, MO, OR, PD, PI, PL, RE, TE, WD, WP)		
12. Provisional landowner access agreement/Provisional Resolution is a) included and b) signed. (Project Types: FP, HA, HB, HI, HR, HS, HU, PD, PL, RE, SC, WC, WD, WP)	a)	
	b)	
13. Photographs of proposed project site are included. (Project Types: FP, HA, HB, HI, HR, HS, RE, PD)		
14. a) Fence Maintenance Plan and b) Riparian Restoration Plan are included. (Project Type HR)	a)	
	b)	
15. Quality Assurance and Quality Control Plan included. (Project Type: MD, MO)		
16. Evaluation Plan included. (Project Type: TE)		
17. Five year management plan included. (Project Type: RE)		
18. a) Ownership deed/Acquisition Agreement and, b) Regional Assessor's site specific map. (Project Type: HA)	a)	
	b)	

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: _____

$$\% \text{ Soft Cost Share} = (\text{Soft Matching Funds} / \text{Total Project Cost}) \times 100$$

$$(\text{_____} / \text{_____}) \times 100 =$$

$$\% \text{ Hard Cost Share} = (\text{Hard Matching Funds} / \text{Total Project Cost}) \times 100$$

$$(\text{_____} / \text{_____}) \times 100 =$$

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, 2012.
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, 2011 up until February 1, 2012.
3. Hard cost share: all out-of-pocket costs specifically associated with the proposed project (i.e., the cost of subcontractors, fuel, outside printing of educational and outreach materials, riparian plants, equipment, (pro-rated or rental rate), skilled labor, cash, subcontractors, permits, easements, fuel, **and** all non-FRGP grant funds confirmed prior to August 15, 2011).

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	-1.5
30-39 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
20-29 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	-0.5	-0.5	-1.5	-1.75
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 Americorps (AC)

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. If NA, then 0 and 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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
6. Does proposal cover entire FRGP area? Yes = all 4 DFG regions, Med = 3 regions, Low = 2 regions, No = 1 region.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
7. Does the proposal adequately describe the process by which corps member sites are selected?	0			-1
8. Does the proposal demonstrate adequate outreach to make potential project managers aware of this program?	0			-1
9. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP)

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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	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. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Habitat Acquisition and Conservation Easements (HA)

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 substantiated by the appraisal.	0			-5
5. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
6. The real property is being acquired (fee title or conservation easement) from a willing seller.	0			-5
7. Extent to which proposed acquisition and/or easement fits with other acquisitions/easements or preserved land in the watershed or sub-watershed. Yes = immediately adjacent to other preserved land, Med = in close proximity (within ¼ mile) of preserved land, Low = in distant proximity (>1/4 mile) of preserved land, No = no preserved land in the watershed. If first acquisition/easement in a watershed, and identified at top priority in a DFG approved Watershed Plan = 0.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
8. The proposed project would successfully preserve existing high-quality salmonid habitat (channel, riparian corridor, floodplain, etc.), or would result in recovery and restoration of salmonid habitat to a high quality level, in perpetuity.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
9. The acquisition is free of: significant obstacles to maintaining or restoring water quality (toxics, pesticides, salts); hazardous conditions or materials; restrictive water rights issues; restrictive cultural or historical resources; public use conflicts; restrictive deeds, easements, or other agreements; inadequate access for management purposes; in-holdings or property boundaries that limit or preclude management options.	0			-5
10. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB), Instream Habitat Restoration (HI), Instream Bank Stabilization (HS)

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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient..	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
For HB Projects				
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. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Riparian Restoration (HR)

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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
6. Riparian limiting factors, have been identified within the watershed (Canopy, Riparian Stability, Escape Cover, Complexity, 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 implements the high and medium priority riparian recommendations from the plan to restore natural function of the riparian corridor for the entire identified reach/sub-watershed: Yes = > 75%; Med = 74-50%; Low 25-49% partial; No < 25%.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
8. Is riparian restoration plan adequate to implement project.	0			-5
Field Level Review – Technique, location, application				
9. The project will utilize DFG acceptable techniques as described in the manual (Part VII and XI).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
10. The plants will be monitored and replanted (if necessary) to achieve the specified standard for success: Yes = 3 years or more; Med = 2 years; Low = 1 year; No = not monitored.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
11. Where necessary to achieve specified standard for success the plants will be maintained including irrigation, weeding, and herbivore protection: Yes = Not necessary to achieve specified standard for success or maintained for 3 years; Med = Maintained for 2 years; Low = Maintained for 1 year; No = Not maintained but maintenance necessary to achieve specified standard for success.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
12. Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type and appropriate successional species for the stream zone (active channel, floodplain and upland) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
13. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Upslope Restoration (HU)

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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
6. If road treatments are proposed, they will reduce sediment delivery to stream channels through; Yes = de-commissioning only; Med = de-commissioning and storm-proofing; Low = storm-proofing only; No = none of the above.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
7. Upslope limiting factors, have been identified within the watershed (Water Quality, Riparian Dysfunction, Excessive Sediment, Spawning gravel quality, 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
8. Extent to which the proposed project implements the high and medium priority upslope restoration recommendations from the plan to reduce sediment delivery to the stream for the identified reach/sub-watershed. Yes = >75%; Med = 74-50%; Low = 25-49%; No = <25%.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
9. If LWD is generated by the project, is it being used at another restoration site? Not generated or Yes = 0, No = -0.5.	0			-0.5
10. Priority criteria: Yes = Project treats all riparian roads, med = riparian and mid-slope roads, low = all mid-slope roads, no = ridge roads.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
11. Yes = Sediment prevented from delivery directly to a class I watercourse, med = class II watercourse, low = class III watercourse, no = class IV watercourse.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
Field Level Review – Technique, location, application				
12. 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
13. The problems have been adequately identified and the techniques, size and type of materials proposed are appropriate for the watershed/sub watershed/land management area (according to Chapter X). Yes = all; No = none.	0			-5
14. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Status and Trends (MD) and Monitoring Watershed Restoration (MO)

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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. The project monitoring questions, goals, hypotheses and measurable objectives are clearly defined.	0	-1	-2	-5
5. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-2	-5
6. The project will employ a suitable, scientifically valid study design, appropriate monitoring parameters, sampling scheme, and analysis.	0	-1	-2	-5
7. The project will utilize protocols approved by FRGP-TRT. Yes = protocols approved by FRGP-TRT; Med = protocols used by other agencies but not by the FRGP; No = not acceptable by FRGP-TRT.	0	-1		-5
8. For existing monitoring programs; Grantee has delivered all the data related to the existing grant to the grant manager. Yes = 0, No = -1	0			-1
9. If extended monitoring is needed the proposal presents a long-term plan with end date.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
10. QA/QC plan adequate to ensure data quality.	0			-2
11. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Organizational Support (OR)

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. 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
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Proposal will focus attention on a watershed with no previous watershed organizational effort or with a previous inadequate organizational effort.	0			-1
6. Proposal identifies measurable tasks to be accomplished in the watershed to develop and implement plan based restoration projects for anadromous fish or their habitat (i.e., develop watershed plan etc).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
7. Extent to which the proposal demonstrates a willingness and commitment to work with others to achieve the organization's goals and how it might enhance other efforts within the geographic extent of the organization.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
For Existing Groups Only				
8. The proposal contains a status report.	0			-5
9. The status report identifies the group's accomplishments including past FRGP deliverables, outreach success, watershed planning and assessment, habitat restoration implementation, and other DFG objectives.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
10. Past activities have lead to development of a watershed plan. Yes = Plan developed; Med = plan in progress; No = no plan.	0	-1		-2
11. Applicants past activities have lead to plan based implementation projects: Yes = in the last 2 yrs; Med = 2-4 yrs; No = none or > 4 yrs.	0	-1		-5
12. 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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	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 (besides project design development which must be delivered at 100%).	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. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Public Involvement (PI)

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. 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
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Proposal will focus attention on a watershed(s) with no previous watershed organizational or planning effort.	0			-1
6. Proposal identifies measurable tasks to be accomplished in the region's watersheds to address factors limiting anadromous fish or their habitat which directly supports local salmonid habitat restoration and recovery efforts.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
7. Proposal demonstrates the current extent of regional stakeholder support through multiple partnerships and/or non-traditional partnerships.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
8. Extent to which the proposal demonstrates a willingness and commitment to work with others to achieve the organization's goals and how it might enhance other efforts within the geographic extent of the organization.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
9. Degree to which proposal meets recommendations of an established watershed, recovery or planning effort.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
For Existing Groups				
10. The proposal contains a status report.	0			-5
11. The status report identifies the group's accomplishments including past FRGP deliverables, outreach success, watershed planning and assessment, habitat restoration implementation, and other DFG objectives.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
12. Past activities have lead to a regional prioritization plan Yes = 0, Med = regional prioritization planning effort; No = no regional planning effort.	0	-1		-2
13. Applicants past activities have lead to plan based implementation projects: Yes = in the last 2 yrs; Med = 2-4 yrs; No = none or > 4 yrs.	0	-1		-2
14. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, Planning and Restoration Project Planning (PL)

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 will utilize DFG acceptable assessment protocols.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
5. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-5
6. If there are significant social issues associated with successful restoration of the watershed, the proposal adequately addresses those issues, or references a prior document adequately addressing those issues.	0			-5
7. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
8. Extent to which proposed project encompasses or completes an entire watershed or sub-watershed; Yes = 80-100% of the watershed; Med = 70-80% of the watershed; Low = 60-70% of the watershed; No = <50% of the watershed.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
9. Extent to which project will develop complete watershed plan: Yes = Complete watershed plan as described in PSN Part VI; Med = Specific assessment based on DFG-acceptable watershed plan; Low = DFG-acceptable ranch implementation plan; No = Specific assessment not based on previous planning effort.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
10. The proposed deliverables include plans, reports, databases, maps, and outreach efforts 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 plan implementation or a detailed description of how landowner support will be secured.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
12. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Cooperative Rearing (RE)

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. 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
3. Fish raised by the Project will be released: Yes = at sites within the boundaries of that same population; Low = at sites adjacent to the source population; No = any other site.	0		-1.5	-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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-2	-5
6. The proposed project is consistent with DFG policies and State or federal recovery or restoration plans for target species.	0			-5
7. Yes = Project objective is recovery and restoration; Low = Project is enhancement; No = Project objective is production.	0		-1.5	-5
8. Released fish are marked According to DFG Commission Guidelines for Cooperative Rearing Projects and DFG/NMFS standards for effectiveness monitoring.	0			-5
9. 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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	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 targeted salmonid species.	0			-1
10. Fish screen plan approved by DFG/NOAA engineers.	0			-5
11. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Private Sector Technical Training and Education Project Grants (TE)

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. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs.	0	-1	-2	-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. Project provides private sector training and education in the field of anadromous salmonid habitat analysis and restoration; or teaches private landowners about practical means of improving land and water management practices that, if implemented will contribute to protections and restoration of salmon and steelhead habitat; or offers scholarship funding for attending workshops or conferences that teach restoration techniques; or operate nonprofit restoration technical school; or produces restoration training and education workshop or conference.	0			-5
6. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
7. Project provides training or technical education focusing on one or more of the following watershed and anadromous fishery conservation issues: fish passage improvement projects; conservation easement and other incentive programs; protecting and improving water quality and quantity; education needed to further regional/county efforts; development of a scientific framework for future funding years; educational demonstration projects; engineering design work, road surfacing and associated activities; research that advances the science of anadromous fish recovery and results in recommendations; monitoring; permanent easement or fee title to riparian buffer strips along coastal rivers and streams that results in the protection of key salmon and steelhead refugia; upslope projects (i.e. erosion prevention and control projects, remediation); protection of key and refugia watersheds; protection and restoration of riparian corridors; assessment projects that will result in prescriptions; TMDL implementation plans (e.g. ranch plans); instream habitat restoration projects; restoration focused artificial propagation.	0			-5
8. Project is a collaboration involving non-profit, for-profit, or public entities.	0			-0.5
9. Includes an evaluation plan, including pre-and post-testing and pre-and post-attendee surveys, performance standards, or an assessment rubric.	0			-5
10. Project addresses needs of the local watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
11. Project promotes personal responsibility for watershed stewardship with the goal of having landowners, resource professionals, restorationists, and communities better understand the salmonid resource and the effect of their own and others actions.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
12. Project directly supports local salmonid habitat restoration and recovery efforts.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
13. Project demonstrates local area stakeholder support.	0			-1
14. Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Water Conservation Measures (WC)

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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
6. 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
7. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality and quantity of the habitat. Yes = Good; Med = Fair; Low = Poor; No = unknown.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
8. Reduced water quality or quantity from water extraction or tailwater documented by, and determined to be, degrading to salmonid habitat by a qualified biologist/hydrologist.	0			-2
9. Water saved or returned to the stream from the project will be available during the times of year when it will provide the greatest benefit to salmonid habitat. Yes = provides greatest benefit to salmonids, Med = provides some benefit to salmonids, No = provides no benefit to salmonids.	0	-1		-2
10. Water losses and potential savings realized through project implementation, identified by a qualified hydrologist.	0			-2
11. Project or diversion will be implemented and operated using BMP's approved by DFG and/or NOAA Fisheries and in compliance with water rights regulations.	0			-2
12. Project will reduce tail water generation through improved irrigation systems or assist in recovery and reuse of tail water, to prevent discharge of tail water to stream.. (Not applicable = Yes.)	0			-2
13. Tail water system protected from storm/high water events.	0			-1
14. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Water Measuring Devices (WD)

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 sub-contracts).	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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
6. Reduced water quality and/or quantity from water extraction documented by a qualified hydrologist and determined to be degrading to salmonid habitat by a qualified biologist, or the intent of the water measuring device is to help manage water diversions in order to avoid or minimize impacts to fisheries.	0			-5
7. Instream gauges positioned to track mainstem flow as well as tributaries that contribute flow for fish recovery.	0			-1
8. Gauge installed in support of salmonid recovery actions.	0			-5
9. Will the gauge be operated and maintained past the expiration of this proposal?	0			-1
10. Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix).				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Water Purchase (WP)

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 sub-contracts).	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. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0		-1	-2
5. Proof of the owner's willingness to sell provided.	0			-5
6. 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; and a valuation, including a description of the basis for that valuation.	0			-5
7. An appraisal is included.	0			-5
8. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality and quantity of the habitat. Yes = Good; Med = Fair; Low = Poor; No = unknown.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
9. Water saved or returned to the stream from the project will be available during the times of year when it will provide the greatest benefit to salmonid habitat. Yes = provides greatest benefit to salmonids, Med = provides some benefit to salmonids, No = provides no benefit to salmonids.	0	-1		-2
10. Proposal describes who will manage the acquisition, how the acquisition will be managed, and how the water rights purchase, lease, or easement will protect and enhance salmon habitat.	0			-1
11. Included is a narrative describing current use, diversion, basis for determining the amount of flow available, how the proposed additional flow will be measured, who will hold and monitor the water rights purchase or lease, who will establish baseline information, and who will maintain monitoring records. Any facilities that may require removal or renovation for flows to enter the stream are described.	0			-1
12. Included is a survey of surrounding landowners and downstream users and a narrative describing how the water rights purchase or lease will impact downstream users, and how surrounding land use and downstream impacts will be mitigated. Also include are any rights or claims downstream users may have to flow. If proposal is based on cooperative lease or purchase agreements, a list of cooperators is provided.	0			-1
13. 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)
<p>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.</p>	
<p>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).</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>Total Score</p>	

Comments: