



California State Parks Division of Boating and Waterways
Quagga and Zebra Mussel Infestation Prevention Grant Program

QZ Grant Application Review and Scoring Questions
Part I: DBW Review

DBW Reviewer Name: _____ Tier Type: _____
 Applicant: _____ Grant Application Number: C
 Grant Year: _____ Reservoir(s): _____

Complete the checklist; copy all management/ownership information as well as other noteworthy information into the DBW Staff Review Table.

	Item Included in Application	Yes	No	N/A	Comments Including Location in the Application
1	Tier 2 only: Was a Prevention Plan and acceptance letter from CDFW uploaded? (CDFW will verify if they accepted the plan.)				
2	Reservoir owner/management documentation provided with applicable sections highlighted for DBW review?				
3	Is the Applicant the owner or manager of the reservoir? (Highlight one)				
	If manager, did they provide a letter from the owner of the reservoir (Owner Authorization Letter) providing permissions if necessary?				
4	Tier 2 only: Are there no more than two reservoirs in the application?				
5	Does this/do these reservoir(s) meet the definition of a reservoir, per Water Code Section 6004.5?				
6	Application contains only one type of project, if more than 1 reservoir				
7	Is this a publicly accessible reservoir for public recreation?				
8	If the applicant submitted more than one application, were the applications prioritized?				
	• If so, what was the priority assigned for this application?				
9	Has the applicant received previous DBW QZ Grant funding?				



California State Parks Division of Boating and Waterways
Quagga and Zebra Mussel Infestation Prevention Grant Program

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is this section of the application complete? (To determine if the application is complete, confirm if QZ Grant funding was or was not previously provided. Let CDFW liaison know of any discrepancies as well.) 				
10	Did the applicant provide early-detection monitoring data that is no older than March of the previous year?				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, does CDFW agree that it demonstrates no infestation? 				
11	Is there a Project Narrative?				
12	Is there a Scope of Work (SOW), including Table of Deliverables (TOD)?				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, does the SOW, including the deliverables listed in the TOD, look reasonable/complete? If no, comment why. 				
13	Was Environmental Compliance information provided in OLGA?				
14	Is this project likely to trigger CEQA/NEPA?				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If so, is the process complete or significantly under way as shown by the uploaded CEQA/NEPA documents? 				
15	Is there a Task Budget?				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are all the items in the task budget reimbursable? If not, list those not reimbursable. 				
16	Is there a Line-Item Budget?				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are all the items in the line-item budget reimbursable? If not, list those not reimbursable. 				
17	Permits included? If affirmative, comment which ones.				
18	Local ordinances: If affirmative, comment which ones.				
19	Agency organizational chart (optional)				
20	MOAs or Lease Agreements: If affirmative, which ones:				
21	Highlight or circle whether they provided a Draft or Final Resolution or Final letter of approval (a draft letter of approval is not acceptable)				
22	Notes:				



Part II – CDFW Administrative Review (Tier 1)

Reviewers: CDFW

Reviewer Name: _____

Applicant: _____

Grant Application Number: _____ (in For Office Use box at start of OLGA pdf)

Grant Year: _____

1. Does the Scope of Work include a description of each task and/or subtasks?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 2. Scope of Work)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4

2. Is the Scope of Work “Table of Deliverables” complete, including tasks and estimated month/year of completion?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 2. Scope of Work)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4

3. Do the items in the task budget, line item budget, and SOW match each other? If no funding is requested for a particular task, then don’t consider a lack of detail incomplete; notate that no funding was requested for that task.
 (OLGA: Task Budget; Line Item Budget; Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 2. Scope of Work)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4
Comments:	

4. For each budget line item that includes materials/supplies and equipment, were those materials/supplies and equipment itemized in detail? If no supplies or equipment, mark NA.
 (OLGA: Line Item Budget)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4
Not applicable	NA



Section A.1. Reservoir and Project Area Description

5. Does the applicant describe the reservoir(s) where the Project will be located, including size, capacity, and the source of water?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 1. Project Description Narrative)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4

6. If the applicant indicated site improvements in the last 10 years, did the applicant describe them? ? (If no improvements, answer NA.)
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 1. Project Description Narrative)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	1
Yes	2
Not applicable	NA

7. If the applicant previously received DBW funding (refer to Part I checklist), did the applicant list those projects, including upgrades to the reservoir/facility, dollar amounts, year of funding and completion dates of any DBW funding at the site? Did they complete Table 1? (If no DBW funded projects based on Part I answer NA.)
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 1. Project Description Narrative)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	1
Yes	2
Not applicable	NA

Section A.2. Description of the Reservoir’s Recreational Activities and Risk for Quagga and/or Zebra Mussel Introduction

8. Does the applicant provide information on the following?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 1. Project Description Narrative)

	No	Yes
a. Types of recreational activities i.e., boating, sailing, fishing, skiing, etc.	0	2
b. Dates of boating season	0	2
c. Number of launch ramps, and if they are public or private	0	2
d. Stocking of fish, species and by whom	0	2
e. Use of live bait	0	2
f. Usage: number of launches at the site, motorized vs. non-motorized, public and private (sheriff, police, commercial amphibious vehicles and concessionaires)	0	2
g. Other launching facilities at the reservoir or within 10 miles of the reservoir	0	2



Section A.3 Description of Management Activities

9. Does the applicant provide map showing the location of the reservoir and Project area relative to the state of California?
 (OLGA: Other Information; Section 1.c.)

No	0
Yes	2

Section B. Project Description

10. Does the applicant include a project description that covers:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

	No	Yes
a. Goals and Objectives	0	2
b. Major tasks	0	2

Section C. Regional Impacts from a Potential Quagga and/or Zebra Mussel Infestation

11. Does the applicant describe:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

	No	Yes
a. Economic impacts	0	2
b. Ecological impacts	0	2
c. Recreation impacts to rural and urban reservoirs associated with a potential dreissenid mussel infestation?	0	2

Section D. Performance Monitoring (Tracking of the Project)

12. Does the applicant describe how the Project’s progress will be monitored and tracked to its completion?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	1
Yes	2



Section F. Early-Detection Quagga and Zebra Mussel Monitoring

13. Does the applicant describe:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

	No	Yes
a. Types and frequency of monitoring activities	0	1
b. Entities conducting the monitoring	0	1
c. Data management	0	1
d. Data sharing	0	1
e. How data will be used to inform the public and users of the reservoir(s)	0	1

Section G. Key Officers and Oversight Bodies

14. Does the applicant include:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

	No	Yes
a. Names, titles, and responsibilities of key officers of the city, county, municipal districts.	0	1
b. Names of oversight bodies, including websites, members, and contact information	0	1

Section I. Project Members/Entities, Administration, and Partners

15. Does the applicant provide the Project team, such as names of partners, consultants, contractors and subcontractors? (If the consultants or contractors have not been hired, were the qualifications and specific expertise/credentials described?)
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	1
Yes	2

Section J. Readiness to Proceed

16. Does the applicant describe the data, studies, or permits existing and/or needed to complete the proposed project?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4

17. How likely is the applicant to complete the project within the 2-year grant cycle?

Not very likely	0
Likely	2
Very likely	4



Part III - Technical Review (Tier 1)

Reviewers: CDFW

Reviewer Name: _____

Applicant: _____

Grant Year: _____

Grant Application Number: _____ (in For Office Use box at start of pdf)

Reservoir (s): _____

For Tier 1 applications, score all reservoirs together.

1. Project Level:

a. Do Project Members/Entities, Administrators, and Partners have appropriate expertise to complete the project? Base scoring on description of relevant education, knowledge, skills, and technical and administrative experience of team members (Narratives/CEQA/NEPA, Sections H, I, J)	Yes	10
	Partially (more than 50% answered)	5
	No/unable to assess based on information provided	0
Comments:		



California State Parks Division of Boating and Waterways
Quagga and Zebra Mussel Infestation Prevention Grant Program

2. Tasks: Score each task separately. Do not score tasks with no requested funding. If there are more than two tasks to be scored, add additional pages as needed. Add comments to explain your reasoning.

(OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA, Attachments from 1 and 2; Task Budget, Line Item Budget)

Reservoir(s): _____

Task Number and Name: _____

a. Are the deliverables and timeline appropriate for the task?	Appropriate – 10 Somewhat/Moderately appropriate – 5 Not appropriate or inadequately described to assess – 0
Comments:	
b. Are the <u>costs</u> for each task reasonable? Refer to the Task Budget and the Line Item Budget. If costs are not reasonable, describe why (too high, too low).	Appropriate – 10 Somewhat/Moderately appropriate – 5 Not appropriate or inadequately described to assess – 0
Comments:	

Task Number and Name: _____

c. Are the deliverables and timeline appropriate for the task?	Appropriate – 10 Somewhat/Moderately appropriate – 5 Not appropriate or inadequately described to assess – 0
Comments:	
d. Are the <u>costs</u> for each task reasonable? Refer to the Task Budget and the Line Item Budget. If costs are not reasonable, describe why (too high, too low).	Appropriate – 10 Somewhat/Moderately appropriate – 5 Not appropriate or inadequately described to assess – 0
Comments:	



California State Parks Division of Boating and Waterways
Quagga and Zebra Mussel Infestation Prevention Grant Program

3. Contribution to Broad-scale Prevention Efforts:

Not numerically scored; provide feedback as a narrative explanation.
(OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

a. Is this reservoir part of a regional scale prevention program or Regional Prevention Plan?	No	Yes
If yes, list which one, and how the proposed tasks benefit the regional partner agencies. How many agencies and reservoirs are expected to benefit? Does funding enhance partner communication? What additional prevention benefits are expected?		

b. Based on the information provided in the application, does the prevention program at this reservoir incorporate visual and manual inspections standards and other infestation prevention procedures consistent with either the Natural Resources Agency Invasive Mussel Guidebook for Recreational Water Managers and Users, or the CA Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan, or subsequently adopted guidebooks and management plans?	No	Yes
If yes, which, and how will they be implemented. What prevention benefits are expected?		



Part II – CDFW Administrative Review (Tier 2)

Reviewers: CDFW

Reviewer Name: _____

Applicant: _____

Grant Application Number: _____ (in For Office Use box at start of pdf)

Grant Year: _____

1. Does the Scope of Work include a description of each task and/or subtasks?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 2. Scope of Work)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4

2. Is the Scope of Work “Table of Deliverables” complete, including tasks and estimated month/year of completion?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 2. Scope of Work)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4

3. Do the items in the task budget, line item budget, and SOW match each other? If no funding is requested for a particular task, then don't consider a lack of detail incomplete; notate that no funding was requested for that task.
 (OLGA: Task Budget; Line Item Budget; Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 2. Scope of Work)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4
Comments:	

4. For each budget line item that includes materials/supplies and equipment, were those materials/supplies and equipment listed in detail? If no supplies or equipment requested, mark NA.
 (OLGA: Line Item Budget)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4
Not applicable	NA



Section A.1. Reservoir and Project Area Description

5. Does the applicant describe the reservoir(s) where the Project will be located, including size, capacity, and the source of water?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 1. Project Description Narrative)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4

6. If the applicant indicated site improvements in the last 10 years, did the applicant describe them? *(If no improvements, answer NA.)*
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 1. Project Description Narrative)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	1
Yes	2
Not applicable	NA

7. If the applicant previously received DBW funding (refer to Part I checklist), did the applicant list those projects, including upgrades to the reservoir/facility, dollar amounts, year of funding and completion dates of any DBW funding at the site? Did they complete Table 1? *(If no DBW funded projects based on Part I, answer NA.)*
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 1. Project Description Narrative)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	1
Yes	2
Not applicable	NA

Section A.2. Description of the Reservoir’s Recreational Activities and Risk for Quagga and/or Zebra Mussel Introduction

8. Does the applicant provide information on the following?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 1. Project Description Narrative)

	No	Yes
a. Types of recreational activities i.e., boating, sailing, fishing, skiing, etc.	0	2
b. Dates of boating season	0	2
c. Number of launch ramps, and if they are public or private	0	2
d. Stocking of fish, species and by whom	0	2
e. Use of live bait	0	2
f. Usage: number of launches at the site, motorized vs. non-motorized, public and private (sheriff, police, commercial amphibious vehicles and concessionaires)	0	2
g. Other launching facilities at the reservoir or within 10 miles of the reservoir	0	2



9. Does the applicant:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 1. Project Description Narrative)

	No	Yes
a. Describe the proximity to infested waterbodies	0	2
b. Give a risk ranking (high, moderate, low) for each reservoir? (Note: this is written from the grantee's perspective)	0	2
c. Include water quality in their discussion (calcium, pH, temperature)?	0	2

Section A.3 Description of Management Activities (including Prevention Program/Plan)

10. Does the applicant provide information on the management of:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA; 1. Project Description Narrative)

	No	Yes	NA
a. Recreational activities	0	1	
b. Decontamination stations, or information on where to decontaminate a watercraft, exit inspections and banding of watercraft to trailers	0	1	NA
c. List of restrictions	0	1	NA

11. Does the applicant provide map showing the location of the reservoir and Project area relative to the state of California?
 (OLGA: Other Information; Section 1.c.)

No	0
Yes	2

Section B. Project Description

12. Does the applicant include a project description that covers:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

	No	Yes
a. Goals and Objectives	0	2
b. Major tasks	0	2
c. Anticipated outcomes	0	2
d. Benefits	0	2
e. How the Project will improve existing conditions at the site and/or reservoir(s)	0	2
f. If the Project will continue after the grant funding ends, how will the work be funded?	0	2



Section C. Regional Impacts from a Potential Quagga and/or Zebra Mussel Infestation

13. Does the applicant describe:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

	No	Yes
a. Economic impacts	0	2
b. Ecological impacts	0	2
c. Recreation impacts to rural and urban reservoirs associated with a potential dreissenid mussel infestation?	0	2

Section D. Technical and Feasibility Approach

14. Does the applicant describe the scientific and/or technical basis for the approach?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	1
Yes	2

15. Does the applicant describe (consistent with Fish and Game Code 2302 and CCR Title 14, 672.1b):
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

	No	Yes
a. Public education	0	1
b. Monitoring for adult and/or larval mussels	0	1
c. Management of recreational activities	0	1

Section E. Performance Monitoring (Tracking of the Project)

16. Does the applicant describe how the Project's progress will be monitored and tracked to its completion?
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	1
Yes	2



Section F. Early-Detection Quagga and Zebra Mussel Monitoring

17. Does the applicant describe:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

	No	Yes
a. Types and frequency of monitoring activities	0	1
b. Entities conducting the monitoring	0	1
c. Data management	0	1
d. Data sharing	0	1
e. How data will be used to inform the public and users of the reservoir(s)	0	1

Section G. Outreach and Education

18. Does the applicant describe the following:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

	No	Yes
a. How and who conducts public education and outreach	0	1
b. Goals and outcomes of the education and outreach	0	1
c. Target audience	0	1
d. How the project will increase awareness transferring to other sites	0	1
e. How the applicant works with other regional stakeholders, such as in a Regional Prevention Program?	0	1

Section H. Key Officers and Oversight Bodies

[Note: DBW says this means board officers, not staff conducting the project.]

19. Does the applicant include:
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

	No	Yes
a. Names, titles, and responsibilities of key officers of the city, county, municipal districts.	0	1
b. Names of oversight bodies, including websites, members, and contact information	0	1

Section I. Project Members/Entities, Administration, and Partners

20. Does the applicant provide the Project team, such as names of partners, consultants, contractors and subcontractors. (If the consultants or contractors have not been hired, were the qualifications and specific expertise/credentials described?)
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	1
Yes	2



Section J. Readiness to Proceed

21. Does the applicant describe the data, studies, or permits existing and/or needed to complete the proposed project?

(OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

No	0
Partially (more than 50% answered)	2
Yes	4

22. How likely is the applicant to complete the project within the 2-year grant cycle?

Not very likely	0
Likely	2
Very likely	4



Part III - Technical Review (Tier 2)

For Tier 2 projects, score each task and each reservoir separately. Copy Technical Review pages as necessary to cover all tasks.

Reviewers: CDFW

Reviewer Name: _____

Applicant: _____

Grant Year: _____

Grant Application Number: _____ (in For Office Use box at start of pdf)

Reservoir: _____

1. Risk of Introduction:
 (Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

a. Recreational access/use	> 5,000 visits/year OR 4 or more public access points OR unmanaged private access	25
	5,000-1,000 OR 2 or more public access points	20
	<1,000 visits/year	10
Comments:		

b. Proximity to dreissenid mussel-infested water	< 100 miles	15
	100-200 miles	10
	>200 miles	5
Comments:		

c. Connectivity to other waters	There are other reservoirs both above/upstream AND below/downstream*	10
	There are one or more reservoirs above/upstream OR below/downstream	5
	This reservoir is not hydrologically connected to another reservoir	0
Comments: List the upstream and downstream reservoirs, based on the application or your own knowledge:		
*If the Delta is downstream from the reservoir, consider it to have reservoirs downstream; if the reservoir receives water from the Delta, consider it to have reservoirs upstream.		



California State Parks Division of Boating and Waterways
Quagga and Zebra Mussel Infestation Prevention Grant Program

**2. Risk of Establishment:
 (Project Narrative; Prevention Plan)**

a. Calcium	Greater than or equal to 15 ppm (suitable for dreissenid mussels to complete their life cycle and become established)	70
	12-15 ppm (uncertainty around ability to complete life cycle)	40
	<12 ppm (unable to complete life cycle)	20
Comments:		

b. pH	Greater or equal to 7 (suitable)	40
	Less than 7 (unsuitable)	20

c. Salinity	5 ppt or less (suitable)	40
	Greater than 5 ppt (unsuitable)	20

3. Project Level:

a. Do Project Members/Entities, Administrators, and Partners have appropriate expertise and availability to complete the project? Base scoring on description of relevant education, knowledge, skills, and technical and administrative experience of team members (Narratives/CEQA/NEPA, Sections H, I, J)	Yes	10
	Partially (more than 50% answered)	5
	No/unable to assess based on information provided	0
Comments:		

b. Does the monitoring data submitted with the application support the applicant's conclusion or plans? (Statement of Eligibility, Section f)	Yes	10
	Partially (more than 50% answered)	5
	No/unable to assess based on information provided	0
Comments:		

c. The funding requested for this reservoir will: (Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)	Start a new prevention program	30
	Expand the scope of an existing prevention program	20
	Maintain the scope of an existing prevention program	10
Comments:		



California State Parks Division of Boating and Waterways
Quagga and Zebra Mussel Infestation Prevention Grant Program

- 4. Tasks: Score each task separately, one per sheet.** Do not score tasks with no requested funding. Add comments to explain your reasoning.
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA, Attachments from 1 and 2; Task Budget, Line Item Budget)

Reservoir: _____

Task Number and Name. _____

<p>a. Is the task described in the Scope of Work effective for QZ Prevention?</p>	<p>Highly effective – 10 Somewhat/Moderately effective – 5 Not appropriate or inadequately described to assess – 0</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>b. Is the task appropriate based on the reservoir's risk of introduction and establishment (as summarized by CDFW)?</p>	<p>Appropriate – 10 Somewhat/Moderately appropriate – 5 Not appropriate or inadequately described to assess – 0</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>c. Are the deliverables and timeline appropriate for the task?</p>	<p>Appropriate – 10 Somewhat/Moderately appropriate – 5 Not appropriate or inadequately described to assess – 0</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	
<p>d. Are the <u>costs</u> for each task reasonable? Refer to the Task Budget and the Line Item Budget. If costs are not reasonable, describe why (too high, too low).</p>	<p>Appropriate – 10 Somewhat/Moderately appropriate – 5 Not appropriate or inadequately described to assess – 0</p>
<p>Comments:</p>	



California State Parks Division of Boating and Waterways
Quagga and Zebra Mussel Infestation Prevention Grant Program

5. Contribution to Broad-scale Prevention Efforts:

Not numerically scored; provide feedback as a narrative explanation.
 (OLGA: Narratives/CEQA/NEPA)

a. Is this reservoir part of a regional scale prevention program or Regional Prevention Plan?	No	Yes
If yes, how will the proposed tasks benefit the regional partner agencies? How many agencies and reservoirs are expected to benefit? Does funding enhance partner communication? What additional prevention benefits are expected? If part of a Regional Prevention Plan, list that here.		

b. Based on the information provided in the application, does the prevention program at this reservoir incorporate visual and manual inspections standards and other infestation prevention procedures consistent with either the Natural Resources Agency Invasive Mussel Guidebook for Recreational Water Managers and Users, or the CA Aquatic Invasive Species Management Plan, or subsequently adopted guidebooks and management plans?	No	Yes
If yes, which, and how will they be implemented. What prevention benefits are expected?		