

## Category III Criteria for Evaluation of Proposals

### Eligible Proposals

As proposals are selected, efforts will be made to fund proposals (1) in different stages of the planning process, (2) with different levels of scientific certainty, and (3) which use a variety of approaches ranging from standard to highly innovative. For example proposals which are "ready to go" will be funded as well as proposals that are more conceptual in nature. In addition, proposals which are designed to reduce scientific uncertainty, such as pilot/demonstration projects or research projects, will be eligible for funding. In general, projects can include an educational component. Funds are generally not to be used to replace existing funding sources for on-going programs.

Types of proposals that are eligible for funding are:

- research -- linked to a restoration action
- planning
- design
- permitting
- land acquisition or easements
- habitat restoration
- construction
- monitoring
- O & M

### Requirements for all proposals

Projects which are the subject of proposals must meet the following requirements, where appropriate:

- Each project be accompanied by adequate environmental document to comply with CEQA/NEPA/CESA/FESA/CWA and other applicable regulatory requirements. Proposals should indicate how this requirement will be met and can request funding to cover these costs,
- Proposal must include an appropriate monitoring program with an integral data analysis and reporting program,
- Project should not prejudice the ultimate decision on the CALFED long term program,

- Proposal cannot be for political advocacy or litigation,
- Proposals must involve only willing sellers or landowners

### **Criteria for Proposal Evaluation**

Proposals for projects which meet the above requirements shall be evaluated considering the following criteria:

1. **Biological benefits to priority species and habitats as identified in the Restoration Coordination Workplan (the workplan is being developed in coordination with CALFED staff preparing the ERPP and therefore will reflect the goals and objectives of the most current draft ERPP)**
  - To what extent does the proposal benefit high priority species and/or habitats as identified in the Workplan?
  - To what extent does the proposal address a high priority stressor identified in the Workplan?
  - To what extent does the proposal propose to restore or recreate ecological processes identified in the Workplan.
  - Is the proposal for a restoration action or type of action identified as high priority in the Workplan?
  - What level of biological benefit does the proposal provide? Does the proposal provide assurances which enable the project or program to provide long term ecological benefits?
  - For habitat acquisition and restoration proposals, is the proposal consistent with the principles of conservation biology such as connectivity, diversity of habitat types, and patch size? (Note: The Umbrella Team is developing additional criteria that are specific to different project types)
2. **Applicant's capabilities, experience, and record of past performance as well as experience and qualifications of key personnel.**
  - Does the applicant's experience, education, or background indicate they are capable of implementing proposal?
  - If applicant has received grants or contracts previously, what is the applicants past record of performance in meeting the objectives and conditions of those grants and contracts?

**3. Technical feasibility**

- Is the proposal sound in its technical approach?
- Have all options been evaluated?
- Is the proposal feasible?
- Does the proposal demonstrate an understanding of the problems?

**4. Local support/involvement/cost-sharing (Local involvement and cost sharing is not a requirement but will be considered in the evaluation of the proposals)**

- Is the applicant sharing in the cost of the project?
- Are other programs sharing in the cost of the project?
- Is there local support or involvement for the proposal?

**5. Compatibility with other non-ecosystem CALFED objectives for water quality, water supply reliability, and system integrity.**

- Does the proposal have multiple benefits related to the other CALFED objectives?
- Are there conflicts with other CALFED objectives?
- Does the project have the potential for significant adverse or beneficial impacts to third parties?

**6. Cost effectiveness**

- How does the cost of the proposal (including direct, indirect, and ongoing operations and maintenance costs) compare to other similar proposals currently being reviewed or which have been funded previously by Category III or other programs? Does funding requested for the proposed activity appear reasonable?

**7. Monitoring**

- Does proposal provide adequate requirements for accounting, auditing, monitoring and reporting?
- Is the monitoring component of the proposal coordinated with existing monitoring programs and with CALFED's proposed monitoring for the ERPP?
- Does the proposal have performance standards and indicators upon which to determine success?