****

**California Fish Passage Forum**

**2020 Funding Opportunity Evaluation Criteria & Instructions**

**Forum Objectives.** Does the project meet any of the Forum’s 7 objectives? If yes, continue, if no, project not eligible.

**TIER 1 (each worth 10 points)**

|  |
| --- |
| **1. Priority.** To what extent does the project relate to a priority stream, river, fish species, or fish barrier issue as identified in local, state, or regional plans?  [*Scoring guidelines*: 10 = Strongly related to a high priority stream, river, fish species, or fish barrier issue identified in a local, state, or regional plan; 5 = Somewhat related to a stream, river, fish species, or fish barrier issue identified in a local, state, or regional plan; 0 = Not related to any stream, river, fish species, or fish barrier issue identified in a local, state, or regional plan.]  **2.** **Diadromous Benefits.** Would the project result in an open, connected river system with increased access to suitable diadromous fish habitat (e.g., consider upstream and downstream barriers, habitat quality)?  [*Scoring guidelines:* 10 = Open entire river system/superior quality habitat; 5 = Moderate distance of access restored/adequate quality habitat; 0 = No or minimal distance of habitat access restored/poor quality habitat.]  **3.** **Overall Ecological Benefits.** Would the project yield broad ecological benefits (e.g., ecosystem-based, multiple life stages of multiple species - including diadromous species, natural riverine functions, riparian/floodplain connectivity)?  [*Scoring guidelines:* 10 = Broad ecological benefits, including extraordinary benefit to multiple and/or important species with an ecosystem-based approach; 5 = Moderate amount of ecological benefits expected to benefit one or a few species; 0 = No ecological benefits expected/no diadromous resources would benefit.]  **4.** **Project Readiness and Permitting.** Will the project demonstrate results within a reasonable timeframe? Is the project likely to successfully complete the regulatory process (local, state, and federal) within a reasonable timeframe (i.e., 6-12 months)? Does the proposal include information on the status of necessary permits and consultations?  [*Scoring guidelines:* 10 = All permits and consultations in-hand all other funds secured, will implement this summer; 5 = Permits and consultations applied for and expected to be received within a timely manner (6-12 months), all other funds secure; 0 = No permits applied for; regulatory compliance not expected within a timely manner or insurmountable issues anticipated/evident. Project will not be implemented within the desired timeframe]  **5.** **Monitoring.** Is there an adequate method and/or monitoring plan in place for evaluating project success? Is there an organization or individual that will be responsible for monitoring and maintenance?  [*Scoring guidelines:* 10 = Responsible party identified. Excellent monitoring plan, research quality data may result; 5 = Responsible party identified. Adequate monitoring/evaluation plan, 0 = No monitoring or evaluation will take place. No responsible party identified.]  **6. Value.** Is the project cost-effective relative to its complexity, regulatory environment, and potential ecological and community benefits? Are the proposed costs substantiated and will the majority of funding support on-the-ground restoration? (points can be deducted if the budget is unclear)  [*Scoring guidelines:* 10 = Extraordinarily cost-effective, all funding for project implementation, and strong benefits expected; 5 = Generally cost-effective, majority for proposed project, and moderate benefits likely; 0 = Not cost-effective, all funding for program management, and no ecological and/or community benefits expected.]  **TIER 2 (each worth 5 points)**  **7.** **Project Management.** Do the proposal, project manager, project team, and preliminary project work instill confidence that the project will be completed successfully? Has the applicant (individual and/or organization) received Forum funding in the past? If yes, was that project managed well?  [*Scoring guidelines:* 5 = Project team is highly capable of successfully completing the project (experts in the field); 3 = Project team is competent and has adequate restoration experience to complete the project; 0 = Project team is not capable of completing the project.]  **8.** **Outreach.** Does the proposal include public and/or community outreach as it relates to the proposed restoration, including plans to disseminate information on: 1) restoration goals and results; 2) sources of funding and other support provided, such as the involvement of partners; and 3) the potential for the proposed restoration to encourage future restoration and protection or complement other local restoration or conservation activities?  [*Scoring guidelines:* 5 = Extraordinary outreach strategy to disseminate project information and to potentially encourage future habitat restoration and protection actions; 3 = sound outreach strategy that pertains to dissemination of information of project goals, sources of funding; 0 = no outreach strategy as it pertains to dissemination of information of project goals, sources of funding, and support from partners.] |