

PFA Grant Evaluation Criteria | Technical Review Team Sheet

Review and Evaluation Worksheet

Reviewer: _____ Applicant: _____

Project Name: _____

Region: _____

PFA Mitigation Fund restoration projects must provide a public benefit by supporting measures that offset the impact of covered species in the PFA Habitat Conservation Plan to the maximum extent practicable.

ALL project proposals must meet the following criteria to be considered for funding:

- The project demonstrates sound principles.
- The project uses methods adapted to the project locale.
- The project complies with state land use planning goals and is compatible with acknowledged comprehensive plans.
- The project follows professionally science-based accepted restoration approaches resulting in ecological or watershed benefits.
- The project has well-defined and measurable goals, objectives, and outcomes.
- The project applicant is eligible for funding.

Recommend project for funding? (Check one):

Yes () or No ()

Fund but with additional considerations? (Check one):

Yes () or No ()

Area 1: Clarity of the proposal

- The project clearly identifies a problem with a clear and appropriate solution.
- The project clearly states needs, outcomes, and methods/tools/actions to accomplish the deliverables.
- The project budget is and costs are defined, justified, and relevant to the project.
- Reporting and evaluation periods are clearly defined.
-

Reviewer Response:

Strengths:

Concerns:

DRAFT

Area 2: Technical soundness

- The project proposes reasonable and logical science-based solutions.
- The project has considered any permits or engineering drawings and needs.
- Can the project be implemented as designed.
- The project considers adaptive management.

Reviewer Response:

Strengths:

Concerns:

DRAFT

Area 3: Watershed Context

- The project address watershed function and ecosystem processes.
- The project addresses limiting factors for the HCP covered species
- The project considers its relative context with respect to other restoration efforts [or species recovery plans](#) in the watershed.
- The project demonstrates community support.
- The project took into account protection measures of other species and general restoration requirements during the proposed work periods (i.e. permit needs, sensitive species needs, in-water work periods, seasonality, etc.).

Reviewer Response:

Strengths:

Concerns:

DRAFT

Area 4: Capacity of the applicant

- The applicant has provided examples of past ~~completed~~ work ~~or and needed~~ skills that demonstrate the project team can complete ~~currently the~~ proposed work.
- The applicant has the capacity for carrying out a successful short, and possibly long-term, stewardship and maintenance of the project, if relevant.

Reviewer Response:

Strengths:

Concerns:

DRAFT

Area 5: Alignment with PFA priorities

- The project clearly aligns with the PFA Mitigation Fund priorities.
- The project demonstrates a benefit to one or more of the covered species listed in the HCP.
- Anticipated outcomes for HCP covered species and habitat are clearly identified.
- Is the scope, scale of impact and potential benefit to the covered species(s) commensurate and favorable to the overall budget and funding request from the PFA Fund.

Reviewer Response:

Strengths:

Concerns:

DRAFT

DRAFT