APPENDIX E
FRGP PROPOSAL EVALUATION and SCORING PROTOCOLS

FRGP-TRT Level Review E2

FRGP Cost Analysis Evaluation E3

FRGP Matching Funds Scoring Matrix..... E4

DFG Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review E5

FRGP Fish Passage at Stream Crossings (FP) and Fish Ladders (FL) E6

FRGP Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB) E7

FRGP Riparian Restoration (HR) E8

FRGP Watershed Evaluation, Assessment, Planning and Restoration Project Planning (PL) E9

FRGP California Coastal Salmonid Restoration Grants Peer Review Committee (PRC)……..E10

FRGP-TRT Level Review

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

Proposal Name: _____

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

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

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

Comments:

FRGP Cost Analysis Evaluation

Evaluation of project cost analysis will include the following:

- Comparison of wages, equipment rates, material costs, and other project costs for similar completed and proposed project work within similar geographic regions.

- Review of labor costs identified by Department of Industrial Relations General Prevailing Wage Determinations (http://www.dir.ca.gov/), Davis-Bacon labor rates (http://www.access.gpo.gov/davisbacon/), and recent California Employment Development Department wage data (www.labormarketinfo.edd.ca.gov/cgi/career/?PAGEID=3&SUBID=152).

- Review of regional equipment rental cost information (including the most current version of California Department of Transportation's (CalTrans), *Labor Surcharge and Equipment Rental Rates* publication (http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/construc/equipmnt.html).

- Restoration costs, labor requirements, and production rates identified in the *Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon,* DFG 2004 http://www.dfg.ca.gov/fish/documents/SAL_SH/SAL_Coho_Recovery/ReportToCommission_2004/22.I_CostAndSocioeconomicImpacts.pdf

Cost analysis evaluation will consider project logistics (e.g. site remoteness, accessibility, coordination required with multiple land holdings), review of production rates/labor requirements in the regional area, and benefit to the recovery of anadromous salmonids.

FRGP Matching Funds Scoring Matrix

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

Proposal Name: _____

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

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

Matching Funds

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

2. *Soft cost share:* salaries of permanently funded employees working for the applicant or its partners (i.e. state, federal and local government employees, employees of non-profit organizations, etc.); office space, equipment, and supplies; pre-existing vehicles, administrative overhead; and cost share funds that will be acquired after September 1, 2008 up until May 1, 2009.

.

3. *Hard cost share:* all out-of-pocket costs specifically associated with the proposed project (i.e., the cost of subcontractors, fuel, outside printing of educational and outreach materials, riparian plants, equipment, (pro-rated or rental rate), skilled labor, cash, subcontractors, permits, easements, fuel, and all non-FRGP grant funds confirmed prior to September 1, 2008).

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

	% Hard Match										
% Soft Match	**90-99 %**	**80-89 %**	**70-79 %**	**60-69 %**	**50-59 %**	**40-49 %**	**30-39 %**	**20-29 %**	**10-19 %**	**5 - 9 %**	**1 - 4 %**
90-99 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
80-89 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
70-79 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**
60-69 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**	**-0.5**
50-59 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**	**-1**
40-49 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**	**-1.0**	**-1.5**
30-39 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**	**-1.0**	**-1.5**
20-29 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**	**-0.5**	**-1.5**	**-1.5**
10-19 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**	**-1**	**-1.5**	**-1.75**
5 - 9 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**	**-1**	**-1.5**	**-1.75**	**-2**
1 - 4 %	0	0	0	0	0	0	**-0.5**	**-1**	**-1.5**	**-1.75**	**-2**

DFG Engineering and GeoTechnical Level Review
Fisheries Restoration Grants Program

Fisheries Engineering Program staff: Engineering

Project:	YES	NO	N/A
1. Is the project described thoroughly enough to determine how effectively the project is likely to perform or whether the project is likely to meet the stated goals of the project?			
2. Given the background information and/or data available, does the project design match the stated goals?			
3. Does the project team have the experience or compliment of expertise required for project success (e.g., demonstrated experience on similar projects; technical expertise appropriate to the project; communication, coordination and logistical capabilities)?			
4. Has the project proponent participated in technical training that is likely to contribute to project success (e.g., fish passage seminars, hands-on bioengineering or erosion control workshops)?			
5. Is this project likely to require future consultation or evaluation of a conceptual plan as it is being developed (e.g., a fish passage barrier removal project that includes a fish ladder for which only a conceptual plan is provided)? If YES, is this consultation reflected in the project time line and budget?			
6. Is the project likely to require the participation of a licensed engineer or geologist? If YES, does the project team include this expertise?			
COMMENTS/QUESTION:			

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

Proposal#: _____ **Region:** _____ **Reviewer:** _____ **Date:** ___/___/____

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
Proposal demonstrates that the project is located in a fire effected watershed as specified in Table 1. (Topographic map shows hydrologic connection between fire and project.)	0			-1
Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III. (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included).	0		-1	-2
The proposed project meets DFG and NOAA Fisheries fish passage criteria (see Part IX, Appendix B and C). Yes = Unimpeded passage for adults and juveniles; Med = Improves passage but does not meet criteria under some high or low flows; No = Project will not meet fish passage criteria.	0	-1		-5
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses limiting factor(s) by Distinct Population Segment/Evolutionarily Significant Unit from the PCSRF report. (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1)	0	-0.5		-1
The project design has been favorably reviewed by a DFG or NOAA Fisheries Hydraulic Engineer and design determined to be appropriate (retrofit projects or fish ladders require field review). Yes = 0; No = -5	0			-5
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California. (See PSN page 2, Statewide Plans, for specific guidance.)	+1	+0.5		0
Fish passage assessment (Red, Gray, Green) completed using the protocol in the *California Salmonid Stream Habitat Restoration Manual*, Part IX, and barrier determined to be: Red or Gray = 0; Green or No Survey = -5	0			-5
For Gray barriers, extent of barrier to anadromous adults over range of migration flows (% passable per FishXing) 1-33% = 0; 34-66% = -0.5; 67-99% = -0.75; unknown = -1	0	-0.5	-0.75	-1
For Gray barriers, extent of barrier to anadromous juveniles over range of migration flows (% passable per FishXing) 1-33% = 0; 34-66% = -0.5; 67-99% = -0.75; unknown = -1	0	-0.5	-0.75	-1
A survey on the target stream substantiates the quantity of the habitat upstream of the barrier. > 1 mile = 0; 1 to 0.5 mile = -0.25; 0.5 to 0.25 mile = -0.5; < 0.25 = -2. (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX)	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
A survey on the target stream substantiates the quality of the habitat upstream of the barrier. Excellent/Good = 0; Fair = -0.5; Poor = -0.75 unknown = -2. (Habitat Restoration Manual Part IX)	0	-0.5	-0.75	-2
For FL projects: Included is a copy of the fee title appropriated or adjudicated water ownership title, deed, or other document that demonstrates the validity of ownership for the water rights being proposed or modified.	0			-2
For Proposed Barrier Removal				
For Gray barriers, identify the crossing size for flow event and the risk of failure of the existing crossing: ≤25 year flow = 0; >25 to ≤ 50 year flow = -0.5; >50 year flow = -0.75; unknown = -2.	0	-0.5	-0.75	-2
For Gray barriers crossing condition: extremely poor or poor = 0; fair = -0.25; good = -0.5; unknown=-2	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
Documented absence of other downstream barriers or a coordinated plan to identify and treat the barriers; no barriers below =0; barrier below with a plan to identify and treat = -0.5; barrier below with no plan to identify or treat = -1	0	-0.5		-1
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

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

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

FRGP Barrier Modification for Fish Passage (HB)

Proposal#: _____Region: _____ Reviewer: _____ Date: ___/___/____

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review
Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
Proposal demonstrates that the project is located in a fire effected watershed as specified in Table 1. (Topographic map shows hydrologic connection between fire and project.)	0			-1
Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	- 0.5	-1	-5
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III, (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included)	0		-1	-2
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses limiting factor(s) by Distinct Population Segment/Evolutionarily Significant Unit from the PCSRF report. (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1)	0	-0.5		-1
Instream limiting factors have been identified within the watershed: (Such as Spawning, Over-winter habitat, Summer Rearing, Escape Cover, Passage, etc) as a priority based in: Yes = complete watershed assessment; Med = habitat inventory report or equivalent; Low = reach level survey; No = no plan/survey	0	-0.25	-1	-2
Extent to which proposed project corrects key limiting factor identified within the watershed Yes = all; Med = most; Low = some; No = none	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
Field Level Review – Technique, location, application				
The problems have been adequately identified and the techniques proposed are appropriate for the channel type (according to Part VII). Yes = all; Med = some; Low = few; or No = none	0	-0.5	-1	-2
The project will utilize DFG acceptable techniques as described in the manual. (Part VII)	0	-0.5	-1	-2
Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type, and species for the stream zone (active channel, floodplain, and upland) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

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

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

FRGP 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: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
Proposal demonstrates that the project is located in a fire effected watershed as specified in Table 1. (Topographic map shows hydrologic connection between fire and project.)	0			-1
Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	- 0.5	-1	-5
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III, (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included).	0		-1	-2
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses limiting factor(s) by Distinct Population Segment/Evolutionarily Significant Unit from the PCSRF report (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1).	0	-0.5		-1
Riparian limiting factors, have been identified within the watershed (Canopy, Riparian Stability, Escape Cover, Complexity, etc) as a priority based in: Yes = complete watershed assessment; Med = habitat inventory report or equivalent; Low = reach level survey; No = no plan/survey	0	-0.25	-1	-2
Extent to which proposed project implements the high and medium priority riparian recommendations from the plan to restore natural function of the riparian corridor for the entire identified reach/sub-watershed: Yes = > 75%; Med = 74-50%; Low 25-49% partial; No < 25%	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
Applicant recognizes Riparian planting plan is required before implementation of project.	0			-2
Field Level Review – Technique, location, application				
The project will utilize DFG acceptable techniques as described in the manual (Part VII and XI).	0	-0.5	-1	-2
The plants will be monitored and replanted (if necessary) to achieve the specified standard for success: 3 years or more = 0; 2 years = -0.5; 1 year = -1; not monitored = -2.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
Where necessary to achieve specified standard for success the plants will be maintained including irrigation and weeding: Not necessary to achieve specified standard for success = 0; Maintained for 3 years = -0.25; Maintained for 1 or 2 years = -1; Not maintained but necessary to achieve specified standard for success = -2	0	-0.25	-1	-2
Project materials utilized are the appropriate size, type, and species for the stream zone (active channel, floodplain and upland) and watershed.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

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

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

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

Proposal#:_____ **Region:**_____ **Reviewer:** _____ **Date:** ___/___/____

Proposal Name: _____

Scientific and Technical Review

Initial score is 5. Points are deducted when the proposed project does not correspond to or meet the intent of the PSN. Final score range: 6 (High) to 0.

	Circle one			
	Yes	**Med**	**Low**	**No**
Proposal demonstrates that the project is located in a fire effected watershed as specified in Table 1. (Topographic map shows hydrologic connection between fire and project.)	0			-1
Proposal demonstrates that the project proponent/organization has the qualifications, experience, and capacity to perform the proposed tasks (including subcontracts).	0	-0.5	-1	-5
Project will utilize DFG acceptable protocols listed in PSN Appendix B.	0	-0.5	-1	-5
Project budget is appropriate to the work proposed and the potential results gained.	0	-1	-2	-5
The proposed project is based on sound planning/assessment information acceptable to DFG and NOAA, and addresses ESU/DPS limiting factor(s) identified in NOAA's 2006 PCSRF report. (Both = 0, only one = -0/5, no = -1)	0	-0.5		-1
If there are significant social issues associated with successful restoration of the watershed, the proposal adequately addresses those issues, or references a prior document adequately addressing those issues.	0			-5
The proposed project, or its results, are identified as high priority in the Recovery Strategy for California Coho Salmon or identified as a recommendation in the Steelhead Restoration and Management Plan for California.	+1	+0.5		0
Proposal includes information required in PSN Part III (Yes = all supplemental information is included, Low = missing one or more pieces of supplemental information, No = no supplemental information included.	0		-1	-2
For Watershed Planning extent to which proposed project encompasses or completes an entire watershed or sub-watershed. If not for watershed planning extent to which proposal addresses key limiting factor. Yes=80-100% of the watershed; Med =70-80% of the watershed, Low= 60-70% of the watershed, No =<50% of the watershed.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-1
For watershed planning extent to which project will develop complete watershed plan: Complete watershed plan as described in PSN Part III = Yes; Specific assessment based on DFG-acceptable watershed plan = Med; DFG-acceptable ranch implementation plan = Low; Specific assessment not based on previous planning effort = No.	0	-0.25	-0.5	-2
For restoration project planning, degree to which proposed project will develop implementation project(s): Implementation directly after this project (= 0), other project development needed before implementation (= -1)	0			-1
The proposed deliverables include plans, reports, databases, maps, and outreach efforts and will effectively convey limiting factors and prioritized solutions to landowners and other interested people.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
Proposal documents sufficient local landowner interest for plan implementation or a detailed description of how landowner support will be secured.	0	-0.5	-1	-2
Level of matching funds and resources. (from matrix)				

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

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

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

Proposal #:_____ **Region:** _____ **Reviewer:** _____**Date:** ___/___/____

Proposal Name: _____

PRC Review

The PRC evaluates and scores each proposal based on the following criteria. Each criterion below is worth a maximum of one point. Points are added to achieve a final score. Maximum final score is 5, lowest score is 0.

Criteria	**Maximum score of 1 point (fractions allowed)**
The proposed project is an eligible project (based on the PSN) and supports one or more of the project types listed in Exhibit A. The applicant has developed a credible project, and has the ability and experience to conduct the project and manage state funds.	
There is a need for the project, such as the proposal demonstrates that it will remediate a known factor limiting salmonids. The project is durable (it will be monitored and maintained).	
The project proposal and objectives are clear, well written, and cost effective. Project tasks are understandable. Techniques or methods to be used are appropriate and consistent with objectives. Project is financially feasible, meets DFG standards and the cost share is clearly identified, allowed, and feasible.	
The project is consistent with statewide/regional priorities. Project is identified as high priority based on an adopted watershed assessment, a salmonid restoration/recovery plan, habitat inventory report or equivalent. The project is important from a regional/statewide perspective.	
There is demonstrated local area stakeholder support. The project is coordinated with local agencies/local stakeholders. The proposal has an educational/outreach/or other local capacity building component.	
Total Score	

Comments: