APPENDIX D
FRGP PROPOSAL EVALUATION and SCORING PROTOCOLS

FRGP-TRT Level Review

Proposal#: _____Project Type: _____ Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___/___/____

Proposal Name: _____

The FRGP Technical Review Team (FRGP-TRT) conducts two levels of review of all proposals received by the Fisheries Restoration Grants Program. The initial FRGP-TRT review is for the purpose of identifying potential administrative, technical, or scientific problems and uncertainties contained in the proposal that need to be addressed during the subsequent proposal evaluation process. During the second level of review, the FRGP-TRT determines whether these administrative, technical, or scientific issues have been resolved, failure of which may result in a zero score for the proposal. Please note that only clarifying information/material will be accepted after the final proposal submission deadline per the following conditions:

- The information/material is submitted to the regional field evaluator prior to the second level review meeting of the FRGP-TRT (this meeting usually convenes in September).
- Amount of requested funds must remain the same or less than the amount requested on the proposal received prior to the submission deadline.

	Yes	No	Resolved
1. The project is not required mitigation. If it is mitigation, list source document in Comments.			
2. The proposal is complete as required by the PSN and Appendix A. If not list the documents that are missing:			
3. The proposal includes provisional landowner access agreement of how landowner access will be secured for review of the proposal.			
4. All the proposal cost share listed will be secured within one year of application to FRGP (May 1, 2008).			
5 The proposal is sufficiently understandable to enable evaluation, and is detailed enough to enable an agreement to be written with discrete tasks, work products, and budget.			
6 The project can be completed within the proposed time frame.			

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/cgi/career/?PAGEID=3&SUBID=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: _____

% Soft Cost Share = (Soft Matching Funds / Total Project Cost) x 100
(_____ / _____) x 100 =

___
% Hard Cost Share = (Hard Matching Funds / Total Project Cost) x 100
(_____ / _____) x 100 =

Matching Funds

1. *Cost share not suitable:* projects, personnel or supplies and equipment previously funded by FRGP, matching funds that will not be acquired by May 1, 2009.

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 acquired after September 1, 2008 up until May 1, 2009.

.

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 September 1, 2008).

Cost share scoring matrix from level of soft and hard matching funds and resources:

	% Hard Match										
% Soft Match	**90-99 %**	**80-89 %**	**70-79 %**	**60-69 %**	**50-59 %**	**40-49 %**	**30-39 %**	**20-29 %**	**10-19 %**	**5 - 9 %**	**1 - 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**	**-1.0**	**-1.5**
30-39 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**	**-1.0**	**-1.5**
20-29 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**	**-0.5**	**-1.5**	**-1.5**
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**
1 - 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?			
2. Given the background information and/or data available, does the project design match the stated goals?			
3. 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)?			
4. 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)?			
5. 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?			
6. Is the project likely to require the participation of a licensed engineer or geologist? If YES, does the project team include this expertise?			
COMMENTS/QUESTION:			

FRGP Public School Watershed and Fishery Conservation Education Projects (ED)

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**
Instruction is focused on watershed and anadromous fishery conservation.	0			-5
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III. (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included)	0		-1	-2
Project focuses on one or more of the following watershed and anadromous fishery conservation issues: 1) Latest research in the science of anadromous fish, 2) Watershed health, 3) Coho/steelhead habitat restoration and management, 4) Land-use practices, land ownership and access issues, 5) Water rights, 6) Fish passage, 7) Conservation easements and other incentive programs, 8) Water conservation, quality and quantity, 9) State, regional and/or county efforts.	0			-5
If education materials are to be developed – submitted an outline of proposed new materials which includes the correlation with the National Project for Excellence in Environmental Education Guidelines and /or California Department of Education Content Standards.	0			-1
Project using established materials and curriculum - identified the material(s) and how it corresponds to current California Department of Education Content Standards and/or National Science Content Standards.	0			-1
The project includes an evaluation plan which contains elements specified in the PSN (i.e. specific learning objectives and tools to measure gains of students, teachers, and/or community).	0	-1	-2	-5
Project materials address conditions of the local watershed and demonstrates support of regional &/or statewide anadromous salmonid habitat restoration and fisheries recovery efforts.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
Project promotes personal responsibility for watershed stewardship with the overarching goals of students, families, and communities understanding the nature of the salmonid resource and the effects of their own and others actions.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
Project is collaboration between nonprofit, for-profit, and/or public entities.	0			-0.5
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
Project demonstrates local area stakeholder support.	0			-0.5
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III, including appraisal, formal management agreement, easement language, or MOU showing the property will be properly managed and maintained with identified funding sources. (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included)	0		-2	-5
Project budget is substantiated by the appraisal.	0			-5
The real property is being acquired (fee title or conservation easement) from a willing seller.	0			-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California. (See PSN page 2, Statewide Plans, for specific guidance.)	+1	+0.5		0
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses limiting factor(s) by ESU/DPS identified in NOAA's 2006 PCSRF report. (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1)	0	-0.5-		-1
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
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
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
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

FRGP Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP) and Fish Ladders (FL)

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III. (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included).	0		-1	-2
The proposed project meets DFG and NOAA Fisheries fish passage criteria (see 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
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses limiting factor(s) by Distinct Population Segment/Evolutionarily Significant Unit from the PCSRF report. (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1)	0	-0.5		-1
The project design has been favorably reviewed by a DFG or NOAA Fisheries Hydraulic Engineer and design determined to be appropriate (retrofit projects or fish ladders require field review). Yes = 0; No = -5	0			-5
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California. (See PSN page 2, Statewide Plans, for specific guidance.)	+1	+0.5		0
Fish passage assessment (Red, Gray, Green) completed using the protocol in the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*, Part IX, and barrier determined to be: Red or Gray = 0; Green or No Survey = -5	0			-5
For Gray barriers, extent of barrier to anadromous adults over range of migration flows (% passable per FishXing) 1-33% = 0; 34-66% = -0.5; 67-99% = -0.75; unknown = -1	0	-0.5	-0.75	-1
For Gray barriers, extent of barrier to anadromous juveniles over range of migration flows (% passable per FishXing) 1-33% = 0; 34-66% = -0.5; 67-99% = -0.75; unknown = -1	0	-0.5	-0.75	-1
A survey on the target stream substantiates the quantity of the habitat upstream of the barrier. > 1 mile = 0; 1 to 0.5 mile = -0.25; 0.5 to 0.25 mile = -0.5; < 0.25 = -2. (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX)	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality of the habitat upstream of the barrier. Excellent/Good = 0; Fair = -0.5; Poor = -0.75 unknown = -2. (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX)	0	-0.5	-0.75	-2
For FL projects: 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
For Proposed Barrier Removal				
For Gray barriers, identify the crossing size for flow event and the risk of failure of the existing crossing: ≤25 year flow = 0; >25 to ≤ 50 year flow = -0.5; >50 year flow = -0.75; unknown = -2.	0	-0.5	-0.75	-2
For Gray barriers crossing condition: extremely poor or poor = 0; fair = -0.25; good = -0.5; unknown=-2	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
Documented absence of other downstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers; no barriers below =0; barrier below with a plan to identify and treat = -0.5; barrier below with no plan to identify or treat = -1	0	-0.5		-1
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.

FRGP Instream Habitat Restoration (HI), Instream Bank Stabilization (HS), CFIP (CF), Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB), Project Maintenance (PM)

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III, (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included)	0		-1	-2
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses limiting factor(s) by Distinct Population Segment/Evolutionarily Significant Unit from the PCSRF report. (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1)	0	-0.5		-1
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
Extent to which proposed project corrects key limiting factor identified within the watershed Yes = all; Med = most; Low = some; No = none	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
Field Level Review – Technique, location, application				
The problems have been adequately identified and the techniques proposed are appropriate for the channel type (according to Part VII). Yes = all; Med = some; Low = few; or No = none	0	-0.5	-1	-2
The project will utilize DFG acceptable techniques as described in the manual. (Part VII)	0	-0.5	-1	-2
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
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

FRGP Upslope Restoration (HU) and CFIP (CF)

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included).	0		-1	-2
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
If road treatments are proposed, they will reduce sediment delivery to stream channels through (Yes = de-commissioning only; Med = de-commissioning 50% and storm-proofing 50%; or Low = storm-proofing only; or No = none of the above).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
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
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses ESU/DPS limiting factor(s) identified in NOAA's 2006 PCSRF report. (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1)	0	-0.5		-1
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
Extent to which proposed project addresses the limiting factor(s) identified within the watershed (Yes =completely; Med = most; Low = some; No = none).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
Field Level Review – Technique, location, application				
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; Med = some; Low = few; or No = none.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
The project will utilize DFG acceptable techniques as described in the manual.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

FRGP Riparian Restoration (HR) and CFIP (CF)

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III, (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included).	0		-1	-2
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses limiting factor(s) by Distinct Population Segment/Evolutionarily Significant Unit from the PCSRF report (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1).	0	-0.5		-1
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
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	-0.25	-0.5	-1
Applicant recognizes Riparian planting plan is required before implementation of project.	0			-2
Field Level Review – Technique, location, application				
The project will utilize DFG acceptable techniques as described in the manual (Part VII and XI).	0	-0.5	-1	-2
The plants will be monitored and replanted (if necessary) to achieve the specified standard for success: 3 years or more = 0; 2 years = -0.5; 1 year = -1; not monitored = -2.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
Where necessary to achieve specified standard for success the plants will be maintained including irrigation and weeding: Not necessary to achieve specified standard for success = 0; Maintained for 3 years = -0.25; Maintained for 1 or 2 years = -1; Not maintained but necessary to achieve specified standard for success = -2	0	-0.25	-1	-2
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
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

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

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-1	-2	-5
The project monitoring questions, goals, hypotheses and measurable objectives are clearly defined.	0	-1	-2	-5
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III, (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included)	0		-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
The project will employ a suitable, scientifically valid study design, appropriate monitoring parameters, sampling scheme, and analysis.	0	-1	-2	-5
The project will utilize protocols that are: listed in PSN Appendix A, or protocols approved by FRGP-TRT = Yes; used by other agencies but not by the FRGP = Med; not acceptable by FRGP-TRT = No.	0	-1		-5
Information to be collected has a regional or statewide perspective, or evaluates a high profile restoration or management effort = Yes; is for a watershed or whole stream level assessment = Med; reach level assessment = Low; index site = No.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
The proposed project implements monitoring identified in a FRGP-TRT approved watershed assessment or planning document as a: high priority = Yes; medium priority = Med; low priority or no plan or pilot project = No**.**	0	-0.5	-1	-2
If the proposed project goal is to assess the effectiveness of restoration activities, the proposal documents the specific limiting factors that the treatments were designed to address, and demonstrates there is sufficient pre-project information or treatment/control replicates to enable an assessment to be made (Yes or N/A = Yes).	0	-0.5	-1	-2
If extended monitoring is needed the proposal presents a long-term plan and identifies potential alternative funding sources.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses ESU/DPS limiting factor(s) identified in NOAA's 2007 PCSRF report (Both = 0, only one = -0.5, none = -1).	0	-0.5		-1
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
Level of matching funds and resources (from matrix)				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

FRGP Watershed Organization and 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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
New and Existing Groups				
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
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III. (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included)	0		-1	-2
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
The benefited salmonid populations have regional or statewide perspective.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
Proposal will focus attention on a watershed with no previous watershed organizational effort or with a previous inadequate organizational effort: Yes or No.	0			-1
Instream limiting factors have been identified within the watershed (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	-0.5	-0.75
Proposal identifies measurable tasks to be accomplished in the watershed to address factors limiting anadromous fish or their habitat (i.e., develop watershed plan, hold outreach events, etc).	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
Proposal demonstrates the current extent of local area stakeholder support through identification of partnerships/sponsors of the project.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
For Existing Groups Only				
The status report adequately identifies the accomplishments of the group in a measurable and quantifiable way and which are linked to the goals and objectives of the group.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
The proposal contains a status report: Yes ☐ No ☐	0			-5
Past activities have lead to development of a watershed plan (= 0), plan in progress (= -1) or no plan (= -2).	0	-1		-2
Past activities have lead to implementation projects (= 0), implementation proposals (= -1), no projects or proposals (= -2).	0	-1		-2
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

FRGP Public Involvement and Capacity Building (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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
New and Existing Groups				
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
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III, (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included)	0		-1	-2
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
Proposal will focus attention on a watershed(s) with no previous watershed organizational or planning effort: Yes or No.	0			-1
Instream limiting factors, have been identified within the region's watersheds: (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	-0.5	-0.75
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
Proposal demonstrates the current extent of regional stakeholder support through multiple partnerships and/or non-traditional partnerships.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
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
Degree to which proposal meets recommendations of an established watershed, recovery or planning effort.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
For Existing Groups				
The status report adequately identifies the accomplishments of the group in a measurable and quantifiable way and, which are linked to the goals and objectives of the group.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
The proposal contains a status report: Yes ☐ No ☐	0			-5
Past activities have lead to a regional prioritization plan (= 0), watershed planning effort (= -1) or no regional planning effort (= -2).	0	-1		-2
Past activities have lead to implementation projects (= 0), implementation proposals (= -1) or no projects or proposals (= -2).	0	-1		-2
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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
Project will utilize DFG acceptable protocols listed in PSN Appendix A.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses ESU/DPS limiting factor(s) identified in NOAA's 2006 PCSRF report. (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1)	0	-0.5		-1
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
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
For Watershed Planning extent to which proposed project encompasses or completes an entire watershed or sub-watershed. If not for watershed planning extent to which proposal addresses key limiting factor. 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
For watershed planning extent to which project will develop complete watershed plan: Complete watershed plan as described in PSN Part III = Yes; Specific assessment based on DFG-acceptable watershed plan = Med; DFG-acceptable ranch implementation plan = Low; Specific assessment not based on previous planning effort = No.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
For restoration project planning, degree to which proposed project will develop implementation project(s): Implementation directly after this project (= 0), other project development needed before implementation (= -1)	0			-1
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
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
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

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**
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
Project will raise broodstock from the stream where the fish will be released.	0			-5
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III including Five-year Management plan with monitoring component and marking program (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included).	0		-2	-5
The proposed project is consistent with DFG policies and Recovery and Management Plans for affected regions and species.	0			-5
Salmonids benefited are listed as endangered (= 0) or threatened (= -0.75) species under state or federal endangered species acts. (Not T or E = -2)	0		-0.75	-2
Project objective restoration = 0; production = -5	0			-5
Release fish are marked According to DFG Commission Guidelines for Cooperative Rearing Projects.	0			-5
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included).	0		-1	-2
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
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
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
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses ESU/DPS limiting factor(s) identified in NOAA's 2006 PCSRF report (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1).	0	-0.5		-1
Limiting factors, have been identified within the watershed: (Such as Entrainment, 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
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			-1
A survey on the target stream substantiates benefit to anadromous salmonids.	0			-1
Project implemented and operated using BMP's approved by DFG and/or NOAA Fisheries.	0			-1
Screen will be in operation when diverting water and salmonids are present.	0			-1
If the screen site is in the water diversion conduit, a water control structure is in-place at the diversion head or built as part of the project.	0			-1
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

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**
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
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III, (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included)	0		-1	-2
Instruction is focused on protocols listed in PSN Part III.	0			-5
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
Project is collaboration between non-profit, for-profit and/or public entities.	0			-0.5
Includes an evaluation plan, including pre-and post-testing and pre-and post-attendee surveys, performance standards, or an assessment rubric.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
Project addresses needs of the local watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
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
Project directly supports local salmonid habitat restoration and recovery efforts.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
Project demonstrates local area stakeholder support.	0			-0.5
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

FRGP Water Conservation Measures (WC) Ditch lining, Piping, Stock Water Systems and Tail Water Management (TW)

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included).	0		-1	-2
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon, or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses ESU/DPS limiting factor(s) identified in NOAA's 2007 PCSRF report. (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1)	0	-0.5		-1
The benefited salmonid populations have regional or statewide perspective, or the project has significant demonstration value.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality and quantity of the habitat. Excellent/Good = 0; Fair = -0.5; Poor = -0.75 unknown = -3.	0	-0.5	-0.75	-3
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			-1
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.	0			-1
Water losses and potential savings realized through project implementation, identified by a qualified party.	0			-1
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
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			-1
TW: Project will reduce tail water generation through improved irrigation systems or assist in recovery and reuse of tail water.	0			-1
TW: Project will reduce the discharge of tail water to the stream and not degrade salmonid habitat.	0			-1
TW: Tail water system protected from storm/high water events.	0			-1
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including sub-contracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
Proof of the owner's willingness to sell provided.	0			-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California. (See PSN page 2, Statewide Plans, for specific guidance.)	+1	+0.5		0
The benefited salmonid populations have regional or statewide perspective, or the project has significant demonstration value.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
Instrem limiting factors, have been identified within the watershed: (Such as Flow, 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
A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality and quantity of the habitat. Excellent/Good = 0; Fair = -0.5; Poor = -0.75 unknown = -3.	0	-0.5	-0.75	-3
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
Included is a narrative describing current use, diversion, basis for determining the amount of flow available, and how the proposed additional flow will be measured. Any facilities that may require removal or renovation for flows to enter the stream are described.	0			-1
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
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			-1
Included is a narrative of who will hold and monitor the water rights purchase or lease, establish baseline information, and maintain monitoring records.	0			-1
An appraisal is included.	0			-1
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including sub-contracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included).	0		-1	-2
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
The proposed project will benefit one or more anadromous salmonid species eligible for protection as listed or candidate species under state or federal endangered species acts.	0			-1
The benefited salmonid populations have regional or statewide perspective, or the project has significant demonstration value.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
Instream limiting factors, have been identified within the watershed (Flow, 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
Reduced water quality or quantity from water extraction documented by a qualified party 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			-1
Instream gages positioned to track mainstem flow as well as tributaries that contribute flow for fish recovery.	0			-1
Gage installed in conjunction with a SC, WC or WP project.	0			-1
Project incorporates a gage, monitored using acceptable protocols.	0			-1
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

Field Review conducted: Yes ☐ No ☐ Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Priority: high, medium, low, do not fund. Justify in comments.	

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)**
The proposed project is an eligible project (based on the PSN) and supports one or more of the project types listed in Exhibit A. The applicant has developed a credible project, and has the ability and experience to conduct the project and manage state funds.	
There is a need for the project, such as the proposal demonstrates that it will remediate a known factor limiting salmonids. The project is durable (it will be monitored and maintained).	
The project proposal and objectives are clear, well written, and cost effective. Project tasks are understandable. Techniques or methods to be used are appropriate and consistent with objectives. Project is financially feasible, meets DFG standards and the cost share is clearly identified, allowed, and feasible.	
The project is consistent with statewide/regional priorities. Project is identified as high priority based on an adopted watershed assessment, a salmonid restoration/recovery plan, habitat inventory report or equivalent. The project is important from a regional/statewide perspective.	
There is demonstrated local area stakeholder support. The project is coordinated with local agencies/local stakeholders. The proposal has an educational/outreach/or other local capacity building component.	
Total Score	

Comments: