2013 FRGP PSN

APPENDIX E

PROPOSAL EVALUATION and SCORING PROTOCOLS

Administrative Review 1

FRGP Cost Analysis Evaluation 2

FRGP Cost Share Scoring Matrix 3

DFW Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review 4

Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review 5

FRGP Americorps (AC) 6

FRGP Public School Watershed and Fishery Conservation Education (ED) 7

FRGP Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP) 9

FRGP Habitat Acquisition and Conservation Easements (HA) 11

FRGP Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB), Instream Habitat Restoration (HI), Instream Bank Stabilization (HS) 12

FRGP Riparian Restoration (HR) 14

FRGP Upslope Restoration (HU) 16

FRGP Status and Trends (MD) and Monitoring Watershed Restoration (MO) 18

FRGP Organizational Support (OR) 20

FRGP Project Design (PD) 22

FRGP Public Involvement (PI) 24

FRGP Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, Planning and Restoration Project Planning (PL) 25

FRGP Cooperative Rearing (RE) 27

FRGP Fish Screens (SC) 28

FRGP Private Sector Technical Training and Education Project Grants (TE) 29

FRGP Water Conservation Measures (WC) 31

FRGP Water Measuring Devices (WD) 33

FRGP Water Purchase (WP) 34

FRGP California Coastal Salmonid Restoration Grants Peer Review Committee (PRC) 36

Administrative Review

FRGP staff will conduct an administrative review on all hard copy proposals submitted to 830 S Street. The on-line application process has the administrative review built into the program, therefore staff admin review won't be done. The staff administrative review will determine if the proposal package is complete and meets all the requirements for submission in the 2013 PSN. 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 2013 PSN deadline (March 15, 2013, by 3 PM). (All project types.)		
2. FRGP 2013 Application Form was used (instead of the on-line application process). (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 within the 2013 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 2013 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 2013 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, OR)		
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 is a) included and b) signed. (Project Types: FP, HA, HB, HI, HR,HS, HU, MD, MO, PD, PL, RE, SC, WC, WD, WP)	a)	
	b)	
13. Water Right Verification included. (Project Types FP, HA, HB, SC, WC, WD, WP)		
14. Photographs of proposed project site are included. (Project Types: FP, HA, HB, HI, HR, HS, PD, RE)		
15. a) Fence Maintenance Plan and b) Riparian Restoration Plan are included. (Project Type HR)	a)	
	b)	
16. Quality Assurance and Quality Control Plan included. (Project Type: MD, MO)		
17. Evaluation Plan included. (Project Type: TE)		
18. Five year management plan included. (Project Type: RE)		
19. 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 Cost Share Scoring Matrix

Proposal#: ___ Project Type: ____ Region: ___ Reviewer: _____ Date: __/__/___

Proposal Name: _____

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

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

Cost Share

1. *Cost share not suitable:* projects, personnel, or supplies and equipment previously funded by CDFW; resources expended prior to the term of the grant; salaries of permanently funded employees working for the CDFW or NOAA Fisheries; mitigation funds; cost share funds that will not be confirmed by February 1, 2014.

2. *Hard cost share:* All hard cost share must be Non-Federal sourced money or in-kind contributions which do not come from a Federal source. Hard cost share can be provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in the implementation of the proposed project confirmed prior to August 15, 2013.

3. *Soft cost share:* All soft cost share is Federal sourced money or in-kind contributions which come from a Federal source. Soft cost share can be provided by the applicant and/or the applicant's partners involved in the implementation of the proposed project. The following in-kind contributions can only be counted as soft cost share regardless of funding source: administrative overhead or the components of administrative overhead (as described in Part IV page 30); **and** cost share funds that will be confirmed after August 15, 2013 up until February 1, 2014.

Cost share scoring matrix:

	% Hard										
% Soft	**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
60-69 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50-59 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.25**
40-49 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.25**	**-0.25**
30-39 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.25**	**-0.50**	**-0.50**
20-29 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.25**	**-0.50**	**-0.75**	**-0.75**
10-19 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.25**	**-0.50**	**-0.75**	**-1.0**	**-1.0**
0 - 9 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.50**	**-0.75**	**-0.75**	**-1.0**	**-1.0**

CDFW Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review

Fisheries Restoration Grants Program

Fisheries Engineering Program Staff

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. 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, is the solution appropriate to the problem and 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:			

Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review

Fisheries Restoration Grants Program

Proposal#: _____ Region: ____ Date: _____

Proposal Name:_____

Reviewer:_____

	Yes	Maybe	No
The proposal as written addresses the identified Recovery Task and can accomplish the Task in part or in whole.	0	-0.5	DNF

Explanation (how the result was determined**):**

The following definitions are used when making a determination.

Yes = Proposal clearly addresses the identified recovery task and the project, as described in the proposal, can accomplish the task partially or completely.

Maybe = There is some doubt as to whether the project, as described in the proposal, can accomplish the identified recovery task.

No = The proposal as described does not address the recovery task identified and will not accomplish the task in whole or in part. Or the task identified does not relate to the project as described in the proposal. Do Not Fund (DNF).

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. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontractors). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. Degree to which the proposal describes placement across the entire FRGP area. Yes = all 4 CDFW regions, Med = 3 regions, Low = 2 regions, No = 1 region.	0	-0.5	-1	-1.5
6. Degree to which the proposal adequately describes the process by which outreach is conducted and corps member sites are selected. Yes = Clear description and extensive outreach, Med = lacks some detail and some outreach, Low = unclear how outreach conducted or how process works, No = no description.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
7. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
8. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

THE ED PROJECT TYPE IS ONLY AVAILABLE THROUGH THE SHRRC FOCUS

FRGP Public School Watershed and Fishery Conservation Education (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**
1. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontractors). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. Instruction is focused on watershed and anadromous fishery conservation.	0			-5
6. 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

7. 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
8. 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
9. Project materials address conditions of the local watershed and demonstrates support of regional &/or statewide anadromous salmonid habitat restoration and fisheries recovery efforts.	0	-.25	.0.5	-1
10. 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	-.25	-0.5	1
11. Project demonstrates local area stakeholder support.	0			-0.5
12. Level of cost share (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. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontractors). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
6. The project design has been favorably reviewed by a CDFW or NOAA Fisheries Hydraulic Engineer and design determined to be appropriate.	0			-5
7. The proposed project meets CDFW 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 *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*, Part IX, and barrier determined to be: Yes = Red or Gray; No = Green or No Survey.	0			-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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 downstream; Med = barrier downstream with a plan to identify and treat; Low = partial barrier downstream with no plan to identify or treat; No = Complete barrier downstream with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
14. Documented absence of upstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers; Yes = no barriers upstream; Med = barrier upstream with a plan to identify and treat; No = barrier upstream with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.25		-0.5
15. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
16. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is substantiated by the appraisal.	0			-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. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
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 CDFW 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. If water right is associated with property, does purchase include water right? Yes = entire water right included; Med = partial water right included; No = no water rights included.	0	-0.5		-1
11. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
12. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	- 0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective	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. 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
6. Extent to which proposed project corrects the problem being addressed. Yes = completely; Med = partially; No = does not.	0	-0.5		-5
For HB Projects				
7. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quantity of the habitat upstream of the barrier to the next 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	-2
8. A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality of the habitat upstream of the barrier to the next barrier. Yes = Excellent/Good; Med = Fair; Low = Poor; No = unknown.	0	-0.5	-0.75	-2

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
9. Documented absence of downstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers; Yes = no barriers downstream; Med = barrier downstream with a plan to identify and treat; Low = Partial barrier downstream with no plan to identify or treat; No = barrier downstream with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
10. Documented absence of upstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers; Yes = no barriers upstream; Med = barrier upstream with a plan to identify and treat; No = barrier upstream with no plan to identify or treat.	0	-0.25		-0.5
11. 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				
12. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
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 CDFW acceptable techniques as described in the manual or approved by CDFW/NOAA engineers. Yes = described in manual, Med = not in manual but approved by CDFW/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 and floodplain) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
16. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
17. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	- 0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. Is riparian restoration plan adequate to implement project.	0			-5
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 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
Field Level Review – Technique, location, application				
8. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
9. The project will utilize CDFW acceptable techniques as described in the manual (Part VII and XI).	0	-0.25	-.5	-1

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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 and floodplain) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
13. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
14. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. If road treatments are proposed, they will reduce sediment delivery to stream channels through; Yes = permanent de-commissioning only; Med = permanent de-commissioning and storm-proofing; Low = temporary de-commissioning or storm-proofing only; No = none of the above.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
6. 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
7. 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 $\geq$ 75%; No = <75%.	0			-2

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
8. 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
9. 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
10. Yes = Sediment prevented from delivery primarily 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				
11. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
12. The project will utilize CDFW acceptable techniques as described in the manual or approved by CDFW/NOAA engineers. Yes = described in manual, Med = not in manual but approved by CDFW/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 cost share (from matrix).				
15. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

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

Proposal#:_____CDFW Region/Federal Domain: _____ 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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-0.5	-2	-5
3. Yes = Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	0	-1	-2	-5
4. Supplemental information is sufficient as described in PSN Part V & VI, including QA/QC plan. Yes = all supplemental information is sufficient, Med = one element is insufficient, Low = one or more pieces of supplemental information are insufficient, No = all supplemental information is insufficient.	0	-1	-2	DNF
5. Yes = The project monitoring goals are clearly defined and objectives are quantifiable with proposed study design, Med = one element does not meet this standard, Low = two elements do not meet this standard, Do Not Fund = more then two element do not meet this standard.	0	-1	-2	DNF
6. For MD: The project will employ study design, sampling scheme, protocols and analysis as described in Fish Bulletin 180. Yes = study designs as in Bulletin 180, Med = study designs not in Fish Bulletin 180 but from other scientifically valid plan and its use fully explained; Do Not Fund = study design not scientifically valid or appropriate.	0	-1		DNF

7. For MO[1]: The project will employ scientifically accepted study design, sampling scheme, protocols and analysis as described in published, monitoring plans for Pacific salmonids. Yes = As described in published monitoring plans for Pacific salmon and appropriate to the application; Med = protocols not published but determined to be scientifically appropriate; Do Not Fund = not valid or acceptable.	0	-1		DNF
8. [2] (a) For existing monitoring projects: Yes = Grantee has delivered all data, analyses and reports related to past and open monitoring grants to CDFW; Med = grantee is in process of submitting final data, analyses, or report from its previous completed closed grant with CDFW; Do Not Fund = the grantee has failed in the past to deliver data, analyses and reports required under previous grants; (b) For new monitoring projects: Not Applicable.	0	-1		DNF
9. For new monitoring proposals, the application includes an example of previous work that demonstrates ability to summarize, and analyze/interpret data appropriate to project proposed. Yes = applicant or partners demonstrate ability to summarize and analyze/interpret data; Med = applicant or partners demonstrate ability to summarize, but analysis/interpretation is not well demonstrated; No = applicant or partners do not demonstrate their ability.	0	-1		DNF
10. If extended monitoring is needed, the proposal presents a long-term plan for funding with end date and plan for reducing costs and/or development of partnerships to secure adequate funding. Yes = long-term plan included with all required information, Med = a partial plan was included with 1 item of required information missing; Low = 2-3 items of required information missing; Do Not Fund = No long term plan was included.	0	-0.5	-1	DNF
11. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
12. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

[1] Criterion 7: For validation monitoring [fish response], ratings refer to Duffy et al. 2006. For habitat response, there is no single, best document for following design, sampling, protocols, or analyses.

[2] Criterion 8: Past Grantees: For YES, application includes a copy of the latest full final report which includes data summary, analysis, and interpretation; for MED, application includes letter from CDFW Regional Office that final report is expected by a particular date.

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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	- 0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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). Yes = measurable tasks clearly identified and described, Med = Some measurable tasks clearly identified and described, Low = Measurable tasks vague or few, No = measurable tasks not clearly identified or described.	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. Yes = identifies many partners/stakeholders, Med = identifies several partners/stakeholders, No = identifies few or no partners/stakeholders.	0	-0.25		-1

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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 CDFW 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 cost share (from matrix).				
13. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. The proposed project would improve, protect, or enhance habitat for anadromous salmonids? Yes = addresses a Key limiting factor, Low = addresses a contributing factor, No = does not address any factors.	0		-2	-5
6. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
7. Licensed professional(s) has the expertise as appropriate to the type of project being designed.	0			-5
8. 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
9. The project proposal has been favorably reviewed by a CDFW or NOAA Fisheries Hydraulic Engineer and plan determined to be appropriate.	0			-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
10. Degree to which proposed project will develop implementation project(s); Yes = Implementation directly after this project (Final Plan), Med = Proposal is a feasibility study, No = not a feasibility study and design produced is less than Final Plan (100%)	0	-1		-5
11. 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
12. Proposal documents sufficient local landowner support for project implementation after project design is completed. Yes = Landowner support is documented by landowner access or a description is adequate to ensure landowner interest, Med = a few landowners have not been contacted, Low = landowner support is questionable, No = applicant has not demonstrated contact with landowners or has not described how landowner support will be achieved.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
13. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
14. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	- 0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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 or Existing Program Support				
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 CDFW objectives.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
12. Past activities have lead to a regional prioritization plan Yes = NA or 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 cost share (from matrix).				
15. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
6. Project will utilize CDFW acceptable assessment protocols.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
7. 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
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

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
9. Extent to which project will develop complete watershed plan: Yes = Complete watershed plan or NA; Med = Specific assessment based on CDFW-acceptable watershed plan; Low = CDFW-acceptable ranch implementation plan; No = Specific assessment not based on previous planning effort.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
10. Extent to which project will develop and maintain a database: Yes = Complete database that address FRGP needs or NA; No = not provide a complete ready to use database, does not meet FRGP needs, or appropriate QA/QC/maintenance.	0			-5
11. 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
12. Proposal documents sufficient local landowner interest for plan implementation or a detailed description of how landowner support will be secured. Yes = Landowner support is documented by landowner access or a description is adequate to ensure landowner interest, Med = a few landowners have not been contacted, Low = landowner support is questionable, No = applicant has not demonstrated contact with landowners or has not described how landowner support will be achieved.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
13. The project proposal has been favorably reviewed by a CDFW or NOAA Fisheries Hydraulic Engineer (for project which require engineer review) and plan determined to be appropriate.	0			-5
14. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
15. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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		-2	-5
5. 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
6. The proposed project is consistent with CDFW 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 CDFW Commission Guidelines for Cooperative Rearing Projects and CDFW/NMFS standards for effectiveness monitoring.	0			-5
9. If extended fish rearing (greater than 5 years) is needed the proposal presents a long-term plan with end date. Yes = long-term plan described, Med = plan partially described. Low = vague reference or description of long-term plan, No = Long term plan not described.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
10. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
11. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. Water right is documented. 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
6. Flow is monitored by a gage at the screen, and diversion will be operated in compliance with water rights regulations.	0			-5
7. Proposed screen meets CDFW and NOAA Fisheries screening criteria including structure placement, construction materials, approach velocity, sweeping velocity, cleaning requirements, screen opening, and bypass design.	0			-5
8. A survey of the target stream substantiates the benefit to targeted salmonid species. Yes = good benefit, Med = moderate benefit, Low = poor benefit, No = unknown benefit	0	-0.5	-1	-5
9. Fish screen plan approved by CDFW/NOAA engineers.	0			-5
10. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
11. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
12. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
6. 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

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
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 cost share (from matrix).				
15. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	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 or modified.	0			-5

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
7. If the project will utilize Chapter 10, Section 1707 of the California Water Code to dedicate the water conserved does the proposal describe how the 1707 dedication process will be accomplished as part of this project, including the data needed to apply for and successfully complete the transaction with the SWRCB (and the court if the dedicated water right has been adjudicated), how these data will be developed, the time line estimated for the dedication process, and planned for a consultation/coordination meeting with the SWRCB, and the CDFW Water Rights Coordinator in the region where the dedication will occur?	0			DNF
8. <u>For water conservation projects that utilize forbearance agreements or instream flow leases</u>: does the proposal describe the local organization that will be responsible for developing the agreement and/or lease, and its experience and organizational capacity to develop such agreements and to coordinate post-project water monitoring and water use in the watershed.	0			DNF
9. 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
10. 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
11. 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
12. Water losses and potential savings realized through project implementation, identified by a qualified hydrologist.	0			-2
13. Project or diversion will be implemented and operated using BMP's approved by CDFW and/or NOAA Fisheries and in compliance with water rights regulations.	0			-2
14. Project will reduce tailwater generation through improved irrigation systems or assist in recovery and reuse of tailwater, to prevent discharge of tailwater to stream. (Not applicable = Yes.)	0			-2
15. Tailwater system protected from storm/high water events.	0			-1
16. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
17. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

Final Score (lowest score possible = 0): _____

FRGP Water Measuring Devices (WD)

Proposal#:_____ Region:_____ Reviewer: _____Date: ___/___/____

Proposal Name: _____

<u>Scientific and Technical Review</u>

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. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including sub-contracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
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 cost share (from matrix).				
11. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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. Proposal demonstrates the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including sub-contracts). Yes = Appropriate level of expertise and/or successfully completed previously funded grants, Med = lacks some expertise, some problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, and/or named subcontractors not appropriate for work, Low = lacks a lot of expertise and/or many problems with successful completion of previously funded projects, No = unqualified, problematic subcontractors, persistent problems with completing funded grants, and/or uncooperative.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
2. Project description includes required details necessary to write a statement of work for the grant agreement. Yes = narrative clear and comprehensive, Med = some clarity needed on activities to be done, Low = Activities proposed are inadequately described and more clarity needed, No = narrative general and/or a list of activities with no detail.	0	-1	-2	-5
3. Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed, is cost effective, and sufficiently detailed to describe project costs. Yes = budget is detailed, appropriate, and cost effective, Med = some budget detail is needed, 1 or 2 unspecified lump sums, Low = more than 2 unspecified lump sums, lacks detail, inaccurate, and/or includes inappropriate costs, No = Many unspecified lump sums, insufficient detail, inaccurate, and/or not cost effective.	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. 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
6. An appraisal is included.	0			-5
7. Proof of the owner's willingness to sell provided.	0			-5
8. Field review conducted; if no, explain in comments.	0			-5
9. 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
10. 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

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
11. 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
12. 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
13. 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
14. Level of cost share (from matrix).				
15. Coho Salmon/Steelhead Specialist Technical Review results.				

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)
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.	
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).	
3. Cost Effectiveness. The budget details identify unit costs, hourly rates, and line items, administrative overhead does not exceed a total 20% 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 cost share (secured, pending [if pending, the date a decision is expected to be made]), and the dollar amount/percent share of total cost.	
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.	
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.	
Total Score	

Comments: