

**Chehalis Basin  
Lead Entity**

**SRFB Project Review Criteria: Detailed Guidance - 2025**

Category	Criteria	Guidance	Total Possible Points	Project Score	
<b>Overall Benefit</b>	<b>1) Critical Need</b>	<b>Does the proposal make a strong, scientifically supported, case for the need for this project?</b>	6		
		<b>1a) Does the proposal identify need, such as an imminent or existing threat to important salmonid habitat that will be addressed?</b>			
		<p>Look for this in narrative - no other location in PRISM app asks for this. Maybe consider this "extra points" for someone who gives a good rationale for the project. If no well-articulated rationale, just 1 point.</p> <p>Acquisitions: Examples of imminent threat: subdivisions/ conversions /planned timber harvest</p>	(2)		
	<b>PRISM Project Proposal Question #1 "Problem Statement"</b>	<b>1b) Does the proposal clearly articulate how the action will address the threat?</b>			
		Acquisitions: Examples: Protection of project site will prevent habitat fragmentation, degradation	(2)		
		<b>1c) Is the proposed action cited in or supported by adopted conservation and recovery plans, habitat assessments or other relevant documentation?</b>			
	<a href="#">See: PRISM: Metrics -- Worksite Metrics- - Project Identified in Recovery Plan / Project Location --&gt; Question #2</a>	(2)			
<b>2) Species</b>	<b>Will the project protect or restore habitat for multiple salmonid species and/or rare populations?</b>		6		
	<b>2a) Does the project protect or restore habitat for multiple salmon species?</b>				
	<p>The proposal must demonstrate that these species will actually benefit from the project.</p> <p>4 or more species get high (max 4 pts)</p> <p>3 species get up to (3 pts)</p> <p>2 species get up to (2 pts)</p> <p>1 species (1 pt)</p>	(4)			
<b>PRISM Worksite Details -- Targeted ESU Species -- Reference or Source Used</b>	<b>2b) Does the project protect or restore habitat for a rare salmon species?</b>				
	Spring Chinook, Winter Steelhead and Bull Trout are considered rare in 2024	(1)			

	<p><b>2c) Has fish use been documented?</b></p> <p>Fish use has been documented through habitat assessment, SWIFD ("documented), or other data source, including observations by habitat biologists (at present: Megan Tuttle, Lea Ronne, and Kim Figlar-Barnes are resources) (1 pt) Only modeled anadromous salmonids use (SWIFD "presumed") (0 point).</p>	(1)	
<p><b>3) Life History Benefits</b> PRISM Project Proposal Question #2 &amp; Worksite Details</p>	<p><b>Will the project benefit multiple salmonid life history stages?</b></p> <p>Addresses life histories including spawning (egg), rearing (juvenile), and migration (adult). (6 pts) Addresses several life history stages. (4 pts) Addresses one life history stage, but quality and expected fish use is low (2 pts) It is unclear about the salmonid life history being addressed. (0 pts) This category essentially adds points for an action that benefits spawning habitat.</p>	6	
<p><b>4) Watershed Processes and Habitat Features</b> PRISM Project Proposal Question # 1</p>	<p><b>Does the project protect or restore natural watershed processes that will improve habitat-forming and/or biological processes?</b></p> <p>Processes the project may address include: erosional, riparian, channel/floodplain, hydrological, longitudinal connectivity. Higher points for projects with treatments that work at the scale and timeframe needed to address a broken process (e.g, a large reach of riparian planting, multiple wood structures over a large area, etc.), and will make changes over a long duration (e.g., protecting riparian area and adding instream wood)(talk more outside Lead Entity strategy)</p>	6	
	<p><b>Barriers:</b> 4a) The project corrects a high priority barrier that limits salmonid productivity. As a guideline, Priority 1 or (max 3 pts), Priority 2 (max 2 pts) Consider the overall severity of the barrier to process including hydrological and erosional process. <b>Assessment:</b> 4a) Crucial to understanding watershed processes (3 pts)</p>	(3)	
	<p><b>Barriers:</b> 4b) The proposal clearly describes the habitat types, habitat conditions, and how the action benefits salmon. The project opens good quality habitat for salmon. (max 2 pts) <b>Assessment:</b> 4b) Is directly relevant to project development or sequencing (2 pts)</p>	(2)	
	<p><b>Barriers:</b> 4c) The design includes additional actions to restoring natural processes. E.g. removal of invasive species, adding wood, riparian plantings (max 1 pts) <b>Assessment:</b> 4c) Will clearly lead to new projects (1 pt)</p>	(1)	
<p><b>5) High Priority Areas and Actions</b></p>	<p><b>Does the proposal address a high priority action in a high-priority geographic area?</b></p>	6	

<p>PRISM - Project Proposal - Question 2/ Project Description/ Metrics - Restoration Metrics - Priority in Recovery Plan</p>	<p><b>5a) Is the project a high priority action?</b></p> <p>For full points, sponsor substantiates that the project takes a high priority action such as a Tier 1 action according to the sub-watershed analysis in the Lead Entity Strategy. If addresses Tier 1 or equivalent, it may receive up to the maximum of 4pts. If addresses Tier 2 or equivalent, a maximum of (2) points may be awarded. "Equivalent" priority would be if the sponsor justifies that the process addressed is more of a limiting factor to salmon than is currently recorded in our Lead Entity Strategy.</p>	<p>(4)</p>	
<p><b>5b) Is the project in a high priority area?</b></p> <p>Since High Priority areas have not been determined by the Lead Entity, sponsor needs to demonstrate why this area is a priority. (2 pts max) Assign 0 points here if project occurs in degraded watershed.</p>	<p>(2)</p>		
<p><b>6) Quantity of Benefit</b> PRISM Project Proposal, project description or #1; Property Details Q#1; Planning Supplemental - or- Restoration Metrics</p>	<p><b>Does the proposal quantify project benefits for target species? Will the project result in a major improvement or preservation of habitat function or species abundance/ diversity?</b></p> <p>Generally, a greater benefit occurs from a greater quantity of habitat treated. But--- do consider quantity of <i>benefit</i>, not just quantity of habitat.</p> <p><b>Barriers:</b> may adjust this curve down when most of these higher mile projects have been done, but for now consider: &gt;5 miles of quality habitat is considered High (6 pts); 4.01 – 5 miles (5 pts) 3.01 – 4 miles (4 pts) 2.01 – 3 miles (3 pts) 1.01 miles to 2 miles upstream (2 pts) - 0 to 1 mile upstream (1 pts) (adjust points up or down depending on habitat quality?)</p> <p><b>Acquisitions:</b> The proposed acquisition protects large, functioning habitat systems and processes and these are adequately quantified (6 pts). Protects important habitat that is an integral part of a larger intact system or area proposed for protection. (4 pts) Protects habitat that is not necessarily essential to the function of a larger system or to sustaining important processes. (0-2 pts).</p>	<p>6</p>	

<p><b>7) Synergy with Other Actions</b> PRISM Attachments - Supplemental; look for a map/ Project Location Question #3a)</p>	<p><b>Does the project build on prior investment and is the proposal part of a strategic approach to achieving habitat goals? Will the project result in a clear net benefit (greater than the proposed project alone) because of this strategic approach?</b></p> <p>High points if the project is part of an explicitly strategic approach. Examples include multiple sponsors working together across a reach or watershed on project development to meet larger habitat goals. Synergy is about building off external projects/efforts, and is separate from a partnership within a project. Medium points if there are near-by synergistic projects not part of a coordinated effort.</p>	6	
<p><b>8) Climate Resilience</b> (PRISM Question 10 and Attachment-Supplemental Questions)</p>	<p><b>Does the proposal address climate resilience?</b></p>	4	
	<p><b>8a) Does the proposal describe critical climate stressors that will impact the project site, with a general indication of how much of an influence they will have (H, M, L)?</b></p> <p>Response should come from the reach-specific information from the CSP Webtool</p>	(1)	
	<p><b>8b) Does the proposal identify the species and life stages that will be most impacted by the climate stressors?</b></p> <p>Response should come from Table of Life Stages</p>	(1)	
	<p><b>8c) Does the project adapt or mitigate climate stressors to increase resilience of the affected species/life stage and habitat-forming processes?</b></p> <p>E.g, adding wood to activate alluvial interactions to improve baseflows. Information on specifics in climate resilience guide.</p>	(2)	
<p><b>Subscore</b></p>		<b>46</b>	

<b>Certainty of Benefit</b>	<p><b>9) Approach / Science-Based</b> (PRISM: Hopefully in Project Description/Proposal Question 10)</p>	<p><b>Is the proposed action consistent with proven scientific methods?</b></p> <p>High points if the proposal clearly articulates how targeted species, life stages and habitats will be protected or restored. Consider scientific methods relevant to each type of project. Proposal cites references, manuals, studies, etc. as a basis for the approach.</p> <p>Medium points if activities are based on scientific methods that may have been tested but the results are incomplete.</p> <p>Low points if uses methods that have not been tested or proven to be effective in the past. Uses outdated or problematic methods.</p> <p><b>Barriers:</b> Follows WDFW guidance about Stream Crossings. Requires limited maintenance, works with natural ecosystem processes, is self-sustaining, considers water quality and quantity issues. Designs address how the project site could be impacted by climate change (3pts max)  <b>Assessment:</b> Methodology will effectively address a data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within one to two years of completion. (3 pts max)  Methods will effectively address a data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within three to five years of completion. (2 pts max)  <b>Acquisitions:</b> The proposal must include a plan for stewardship/legal defense to receive full points.</p>	3	
	<p><b>10) Clear Goals and Objectives</b> (PRISM Project Proposal question #3 and #4)</p>	<p><b>Does the proposal include quantifiable actions, goals and SMART* objectives?</b>  "SMART" = specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound</p> <p>For full points, follows RCO guidance on what makes a "SMART" project. Goals tied to site-specific conditions and salmon needs at the site level. (3 pts)</p> <p>Actions, goals and objectives are adequately described but not fully quantifiable (2 pts)  Poorly articulated goals lead to low points.</p>	3	
	<p><b>11) Scope</b> PRISM Project Proposal question #5 and look for and attachment with a Table!</p>	<p><b>Does the project scope appropriately cover all project elements necessary to develop, implement, and complete the project?</b></p> <p>For full points: Project goals and objectives are clearly stated, realistic, measurable, and achievable; methods are clearly defined and appropriate to meet stated objectives. The proposal provides strong evidence that project scope covered all project elements necessary to develop, implement, and complete the project.</p> <p>Medium points when there isn't enough information about how the project would meet its goals.</p> <p>Low points when the methodology does not appear to cover all project elements necessary to</p>	3	

		develop, implement, and complete the project.		
	<b>12) Budget &amp; Cost Effectiveness</b>	<b>Is the project budget realistic and does it contain sufficient detail? Is the project cost effective? Does the project leverage other funding sources?</b>	6	
	PRISM: Costs. + Attachments	11a) Does the proposal's budget provide sufficient detail to determine whether or not projected expenses are realistic to achieve the project's stated goals	(1)	
		11b) Does the project have a low cost a relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in that location?	(2)	
		11c) Has the sponsor clearly leveraged available resources to reduce costs and maximize benefits (e.g., use of matching funds, volunteer labor, combining individual projects/tasks to reduce administrative costs, or other efficiencies). Match above and beyond the requirements.	(3)	
	<b>Subscore</b>		<b>15</b>	
<b>Ability to Implement</b>	<b>13) Team Experience</b>	<b>Does the project sponsor have a demonstrated ability to complete projects as proposed, on time and according to budget?</b>	3	
	(PRISM Project Proposal question #11, and get RCO staff input)	For full points, sponsor has managed multiple similar projects and completed them as proposed, and there are no concerns on file about the applicant. Applicant roles, responsibilities, and qualifications are adequate for the scope of work. Project sponsor or team members have experience successfully managing or implementing at least one project similar to the one proposed (2 pts) Project sponsor and team members lack experience conducting work similar to the proposed action. (0 pts)		
	<b>14) Schedule/ Sequence</b>	<b>Does the proposal include a logical sequence of actions and is the milestone schedule realistic?</b>	3	
(PRISM Project Proposal question #5 and look for attached table)	Schedule is clearly described and includes detail on construction tasks and permit schedule. Environmental and regulatory compliance requirements already met or no major impediments apparent that might delay completion. It will occur in the correct sequence and is independent of other actions being taken first. -The project receives high points if there is a compelling reason for moving it forward without delay.  <b>Barriers:</b> For high points, the project is occurring in the correct sequence relative to any upstream or downstream project.			

<p><b>15) Permits</b> (PRISM "Project Permits")</p>	<p><b>Are permits required for the project to proceed? If yes, what is the status of permit approval and is the permitting plan/schedule reasonable?</b></p> <p>No permits are needed or the permitting plan/schedule is reasonable and the status of existing permits or permitting applications is known (3 pts)</p> <p><b>Barriers:</b> For design-only projects: The sponsor’s schedule needs to include a list of expected needed permits and a reasonable timeline submitting applications (max 3 pts)</p> <p><b>Assessments:</b> Permits are generally not needed for assessments. Give (3 pts) in this category</p>	3	
<p><b>16) Landowners</b> (Attachment - Supplemental Questions; Attachments - letters of support)</p>	<p><b>Do the participating and affected landowners support the project?</b></p> <p>For full (3) points, proposal documents that landowners are supportive of the proposal and that they have been informed of any risks and are supportive anyway (need a letter of support) -If neighboring landowners are affected by the project, support is documented.</p> <p><b>Barriers:</b> For County culverts, full points if letter of support from adjacent landowners, not just the County</p> <p><b>Acquisitions:</b> The sponsor and landowner have demonstrated one of the following: a Signed Purchase &amp; Sale Agreement; Landowner commitment to selling property or conservation easement at less than full market value (bargain sale); Landowner commitment to making significant financial contribution toward stewardship endowment and/or project cost (3 pts)</p>	3	
<p><b>17) Support Local Values</b> (Attachment - Supplemental Questions/Letter of support)</p>	<p><b>Does the proposal identify key stakeholders and document their support for the project? (i.e. documented support from social, economic, and cultural groups)?</b></p> <p>Needs to actually document support to get full points (examples: letter of support, reference to the specific project in a local plan, etc.,) Possible indicators of local support and benefit: demonstrated benefits for agricultural community, recreational community, or positive short or long term impact on the basin economy in terms of jobs/tax-base; demonstrates that the quality of life around the project improves; Produces secondary community benefits such as increased public safety, decreased risk of property damage or improvements to physical infrastructure.</p>	3	

<p><b>18) Long Term Education and Outreach</b> (Attachment - Supplemental Questions)</p>	<p><b>Will the project incorporate a long-term education/outreach program? Will the project foster a community conservation ethic through citizen involvement?</b></p> <p>Incorporates a long-term education outreach program that employs three or more outreach techniques, such as multi-year volunteer events, marketing (signs, social media), technology (video, web, distance learning), on-site activities (hands-on activities, field trips, skill building), and learning activities (citizen science, project-based learning, outdoor class rooms, landowner demonstration); or has great potential to foster a community conservation ethic through citizen involvement. (3-4 pts)</p> <p>Offers a one-time or short duration education component using fewer than three techniques, such as a single volunteer event, marketing (signs, social media), technology (video, web, distance learning), on-site activities ( tree plantings, hands-on activities, field trips, skill building), and learning activities (citizen science, project-based learning, outdoor class rooms, landowner demonstration). (1-2 pts) *Look for Strong Salmon Futures sign in budget!</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p><b>19) Partnerships</b> (Attachment - Supplemental Questions)</p>	<p><b>Will the project benefit from a diverse, multi-stakeholder partnership?</b></p> <p>The project has documented multiple partners (2+) that understand their commitments throughout the life of the project and beyond. Sponsor has a strong track record of building and maintaining multi-stakeholder partnerships over time. Partnerships include pro-bono technical support, volunteers, leveraging capacity through working with other organizations, etc. (3-4 pts) (don't count funding sources or groups receiving funding through this grant. Don't count cases where this work is building off other efforts, such as on Berwick Creek, but rather just count partners on just project itself)</p> <p>The project has 1 partnership with less defined commitments and no long-term involvement. (2 pts) (don't count cases where this work is building off other efforts, such as on Berwick Creek, but rather just count partners on project itself)</p>	<p>4</p>	
<p><b>Subscore</b></p>		<p><b>23</b></p>	
<p><b>Total</b></p>		<p><b>84</b></p>	