

**GUIDANCE ON RESTORATION PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA FOR THE COSCO BUSAN  
RECREATIONAL USE GRANT PROGRAM  
ADMINISTERED BY THE CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF FISH AND GAME  
AND  
THE CALIFORNIA STATE LANDS COMMISSION**

Each recreation project proposal submitted through the Cosco Busan Oil Spill Settlement – Recreational Use Grant Program (Program) will be evaluated using the criteria described below. Projects must meet the Threshold Criteria to be considered further. Projects will be selected for funding based on how well they meet the Evaluation Criteria.

<b>Criterion from DARP</b>	<b>Notes on Application to Recreation</b>
<b><i>Threshold Criteria</i></b>	<b>If a project does not meet these criteria, it will not be considered further.</b>
1. Consistency with Trustees' Restoration Goals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project address fishing, boating, other water-based recreation activities, and/or shoreline recreation activities?</li> <li>• Does the location or scope of the project benefits fall within the geographic scope of the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA)?<sup>i</sup></li> </ul>
2. Technical Feasibility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project must be technically and procedurally sound.</li> </ul>
<b><i>Evaluation Criteria</i></b>	
1. Nexus between the Restoration Project and the Impacts of the Spill on Recreation Uses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To what extent does the project address fishing, boating, other water-based recreation activities, and/or shoreline recreation activities that were affected by the Spill?</li> <li>• To what extent does the project location or geographic scope of project benefits correspond to areas impacted by the spill?</li> </ul>
2. Compliance with Applicable Laws	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project proponent or implementer have the legal right to access the project site and conduct the project?</li> <li>• Are there willing landowners who support the project?</li> <li>• Project proponents will need to be able to demonstrate that they can meet all applicable laws and obtain all relevant permits. One indicator of a strong proposal on this criterion would be if they have already obtained or are in the process of obtaining relevant permits. For projects that are in earlier stages of development, we would want to see evidence that</li> </ul>

	<p>project proponents are familiar with the relevant permits. Additional proof would include previous projects with similar permitting requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project proponents should be able to demonstrate that their project is in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and/or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as appropriate. For projects that are in earlier stages of development, we would want to see evidence that project proponents are familiar with CEQA and/or NEPA requirements.</li> </ul>
3. Cost-Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects that deliver greater recreation benefits relative to their costs will be preferred over projects that provide fewer benefits relative to their costs.</li> </ul>
4. Range of Restoration Project Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will a broad range of user groups benefit from the project?</li> <li>• Will users from multiple geographic areas benefit from the project?</li> <li>• Is the project accessible to a broad range of individuals within a user group (e.g., can anyone who chooses use the project? is the project universally accessible to people with or without disabilities?)</li> <li>• Are there ancillary natural resource benefits?</li> </ul>
5. Time to Provide Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects that begin providing public benefits soon are preferred to projects where the onset of benefits is not expected until far into the future. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ For capital improvements, projects that are “shovel ready” will be preferred over those projects that are in the design or pre-design phases. Projects where permitting is completed (or otherwise straightforward) will be preferred to projects that require complex permitting processes that will take significant time.</li> <li>○ For projects in general, those projects that can articulate how public benefits will begin in the near future will be preferred to</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	projects that cannot.
6. Duration of Project Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Projects expected to have longer term benefits are favored over those that have short effective project lives.</li> <li>• If long term benefits are expected, is there a mechanism in place to ensure that those benefits are realized?</li> </ul>
7. Maintenance and Oversight of Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the party(ies) responsible for project implementation/maintenance have the legal authority and organizational capacity to oversee implementation/maintenance? If projects are expected to have long term benefits, is there an entity that will be responsible for maintaining the project over time?</li> </ul>
8. Avoidance of Collateral Injury from Project Implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project should not benefit one user group to the detriment of others.</li> <li>• Project should not cause significant harm to natural resources.</li> </ul>
9. Likelihood of Project Success	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project proponents will need to be able to demonstrate that they have a high likelihood of successfully implementing the project (e.g., obtaining necessary permits, constructing improvements, carrying out project-related activities), and that the project is otherwise technically feasible. Projects better able to demonstrate these capabilities are preferred.</li> <li>• Projects that have a high likelihood of either drawing new users or improving experience of existing users (once implemented) are preferred.</li> </ul>
10. Contribution to a Comprehensive Suite of Projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project fit within a total suite of selected restoration projects that address the geographic distribution and types of recreation impacts associated with the spill?</li> </ul>
11. Total Project Cost and Accuracy of Estimate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Estimated project cost should be based upon a comprehensive list of relevant line items necessary to implement the project (e.g., design, permit, implement, monitor, maintain, and manage the project).</li> <li>• Project proponents will need to be able to demonstrate the project costs are reasonable.</li> <li>• Trustees prefer the least costly project of</li> </ul>

	otherwise equivalent alternatives
12. Effect of Project on Public Health and Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects that enhance public health and safety are preferred</li> </ul>
13. Opportunities for Collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Projects with matching funds are preferred to projects without matching funds.</li> </ul>
14. Prevention of Future Injury from the Cosco Busan Spill	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A project that addresses ongoing diminishment of recreational use and enjoyment of natural resources that resulted from the spill will be preferred on this criterion.</li> </ul>
<b>Supplemental Criteria:</b> These would be considered when appropriate (e.g., in the case of more than one grant proposal being equally preferred based upon the above criteria)	
1. Non-Duplication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project funding from spill-related grant should not displace other funds.</li> <li>Project should not be duplicating other efforts already ongoing at the same location.</li> </ul>
2. Ability to Document Benefits to the Public	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will there be objective indicators that the project has either increased the number of users or improved the recreational experience of users?</li> </ul>
3. Education/Research Value	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project have the potential for public education and outreach?</li> </ul>

---

<sup>i</sup> "Recreation benefits" refers to both (a) the number of users that benefit from a project and (b) the magnitude of the benefit per user.