Scoring Reference Sheet for Restoration and Protection Project Proposals –Chehalis River Basin Lead Entity (WRIAs 22 and 23)

The purpose of this document is to explain the scoring system used to evaluate proposals that have been submitted in response to the call-for-proposals. The basic approach is to first evaluate whether the proposal is recommended for evaluation and if so, assign a project score for ranking purposes. The detail of each step is described below.

# Recommendation for Evaluation

This is a threshold criterion where projects are either recommended for scoring evaluation or not recommended on the basis of whether or not they meet minimum standards for further consideration.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Meets Minimum Standard?** | **Assessment**  |
| The project should be evaluated because (1) it has benefits that are likely to be realized, and (2) the project is implementable and (3) the costs are clearly explained and reasonable. | Recommended for Evaluation |
| The project has one or more fatal flaws including: (1) project benefits will not be realized, or (2) the project is not implementable, or (3) the project costs are not clearly explained or are unreasonable. | Not Recommended for Evaluation |

For projects that are recommended for further evaluation, they will be assessed on how well they meet individual scoring criteria. The tables below show the scores associated with “High”, “Medium”, and “Low” value assessments for each criterion.

The project score is calculated by adding the scores of the Overall Effectiveness Criteria and then multiplying the sum by weighting factors: Certainty of Benefits, Ability to Implement and Cost. Each weighting factor has a maximum weight of 100%:

$$Overall Effectiveness\*Certainty of Benefits \left(\%\right)\*Ability to Implement\left(\%\right)\*Cost\left(\%\right)=Project Score$$

# Overall Effectiveness Criteria

(The maximum score for an individual project is 51 points. Total scores are calculated by adding up the individual criterion scores in this category. The total score for Overall Effectiveness will be the basis to which weighting factors are applied)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Critical Need?**  | **Score** | **Assessment** |
| Is identified directly through habitat assessments, reports or other scientific information from WRIA 22 and 23  | 6 | High |
| Is identified through linkages to habitat assessments, reports or other scientific information from areas outside of WRIA 22 and 23 | 4 | Medium |
| Is unclear or lacks scientific information about the problem being addressed.  | 0 | Low |
| **2. Species** |  |  |
| Addresses multiple species or unique populations of salmonids essential for recovery or Endangered Species Act-listed fish species or non-listed populations primarily supported by natural spawning. Fish use has been documented.  | 6 | High |
| Addresses a moderate number of species or unique populations of salmonids essential for recovery or ESA-listed fish species or non-listed populations primarily supported by natural spawning. Fish use has been documented.  | 4 | Medium |
| Addresses a single or small number of species of a low priority. Fish use may not have been documented.  | 0 | Low |
| **3. Watershed Processes and Habitat Features** |  |  |
| **Restoration:** Addresses high priority habitat features and/or watershed process that significantly protect or limit the salmonid productivity in the area. **Acquisition:** More than 60 percent of the total project area is intact habitat, or if less than 60 percent project must be a combination that includes restoration. **Assessment:** Crucial to understanding watershed processes, is directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will clearly lead to new projects in high priority areas. | 6 | High |
| **Restoration:** May not address the most important limiting factor but will improve habitat conditions. **Acquisition:** 40-60 percent of the total project area is intact habitat, or if less than 40-60 percent, project must be a combination that includes restoration. **Assessments:** Will lead to new projects in moderate priority areas and is independent of other key conditions being addressed first. | 4 | Medium |
| Has not been proven to address an important habitat condition in the area. | 0 | Low |
| **4. High Priority Areas and Actions** |  |  |
| **Restoration and Protection:** Is a high priority action in a high priority geographic area. **Assessment:** Fills an important data gap in a high priority area. | 6 | High |
| **Restoration and Protection:** May be an important action but in a moderate priority geographic area. **Assessment:** Fills an important data gap, but is in a moderate priority area. | 4 | Medium |
| Has not been proven to address an important habitat condition in the area. | 0 | Low |
| **5. Life History Benefits** |  |  |
| Addresses an important life history stage or habitat type that limits the productivity of the salmonid species in the area or project addresses multiple life history requirements.  | 6 | High |
| Addresses fewer life history stages or habitat types that limit the productivity of the salmonid species in the area or partially addresses fewer life history requirements.  | 4 | Medium |
| It is unclear about the salmonid life history being addressed.  | 0 | Low |
| **6. Quantity of Benefit** |  |  |
| Project benefits have been quantified for target species (i.e., area, length, or other metric of habitat restored or protected) and will result in a major improvement or preservation of habitat function or species abundance/diversity. | 6 | High |
| Project benefits have been quantified for target species (i.e., area, length, or other metric of habitat restored or protected) but will result in a moderate to small improvement or preservation of habitat function or species abundance/diversity. | 4 | Medium |
| Project benefits have not been quantified for target species or will yield an insignificant improvement in habitat function or species abundance and diversity. | 0 | Low |
| **7. Synergy with other Actions** |  |  |
| The proposed project is integrated with or complements other restoration or protection actions in WRIA 22 and 23 and is expected to result in a clear, large net benefit (greater than the proposed project alone) because of this relationship. | 6 | High |
| The proposed project is linked to other restoration or protection actions in WRIA 22 and 23 but the relationship will only result in a minor net benefit that is greater than the proposed project alone. | 4 | Medium |
| No linkage with other restoration or protection actions | 0 | Low |
| **8. Outreach - Long Term Education and Outreach** |  |  |
| Incorporates a long-term education outreach program that employs three or more outreach techniques, such as 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). | 3 | High |
| Offers a one-time or short duration education component using fewer than three techniques, such as 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). | 2 | Medium |
| Project does not incorporate any education component. | 0 | Low |
| **9. Outreach - Volunteers** |  |  |
| The project uses a large pool of volunteer labor from multiple age and socio-economic groups for monitoring (neighbors/students) and key construction | 3 | High |
| The project uses a limited numbers of volunteers over a short period of time for key construction components. May also include technical pro bono involvement. | 2 | Medium |
| Uses no volunteer labor. | 0 | Low |
| **10. Partnerships** |  |  |
| The project has documented multiple partners (3+) that understand their commitments throughout the life of the project and beyond. | 3 | High |
| The project has 1-2 partnerships with less defined commitments and no long-term involvement. | 2 | Medium |
| No partnerships. | 0 | Low |

# Weighting Factors

## Certainty of Benefits

(Maximum value is 100%. The percentage value for this weighting factor is calculated by adding all of the scores assigned to the project and then dividing by the total possible score for the category. Weighting factors adjust the Overall Effectiveness score)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. Approach** | **Score** | **Assessment** |
| **Restoration or Protection**: activities are consistent with proven scientific methods. **Assessment:** Methodology will effectively address an information/data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within one to two years of completion. **Acquisition:** clearly describes and funds stewardship of the area or facility for more than 10 years. | 3 | High |
| **Restoration or Protection:** activities are based on scientific methods that may have been tested but the results are incomplete. **Assessment:** Methods will effectively address a data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within three to five years of completion. **Acquisition:** clearly describes but does not fund stewardship of the area or facility for more than 10 years.  | 2 | Medium |
| Uses methods that have not been tested or proven to be effective in the past. Acquisition: does not describe or fund stewardship of the area or facility. | 0 | Low |
| **2. Appropriate Scope** |  |  |
| Scope is appropriate to meet its goals and objectives.  | 3 | High |
| Is moderately appropriate to meet its goals and objectives.  | 2 | Medium |
| The methodology does not appear to meet the goals and objectives of the project.  | 0 | Low |
| **3. Clear Goals and Objectives** |  |  |
| Quantifiable actions, goals and "SMART" objectives are identified in the proposal"SMART" = specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound | 3 | High |
| Actions, goals and objectives are adequately described but not fully quantifiable | 2 | Medium |
| Actions, goals and objectives are not adequately described  | 0 | Low |

## Ability to Implement

(Maximum value is 100%. The percentage value for this weighting factor is calculated by adding all of the scores assigned to the project and then dividing by the total possible score for the category. Weighting factors adjust the Overall Effectiveness score)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **1. Team Experience** | **Score** | **Assessment** |
| Project sponsor or team members have experience successfully managing or implementing multiple projects similar to the one proposed | 3 | High |
| Project sponsor or team members have experience successfully managing or implementing at least one project similar to the one proposed | 2 | Medium |
| Project sponsor and team members lack experience conducting work similar to the proposed action | 0 | Low |
| **2. Overall Schedule**  |  |  |
| Schedule is clearly described with tasks in the correct sequence and is independent of other actions being taken first.  | 3 | High |
| Schedule is clearly described with tasks in the correct sequence and but is dependent on other actions being taken first.  | 2 | Medium |
| Schedule is unclear or is in the wrong sequence with other protection and restoration actions.  | 0 | Low |
| **3. Permits** |  |  |
| No permits are needed or the permitting plan/schedule is reasonable and the status of existing permits or permitting applications is known  | 3 | High |
| Permits are needed but the permitting plan/schedule has some resolvable uncertainty about the process or date permits will be obtained | 2 | Medium |
| Permits are needed but permitting plan/schedule is not feasible  | 0 | Low |
| **4. Land Owners** |  |  |
| Project does not require landowner approvals or landowners have already approved the proposed work | 3 | High |
| Project does require landowner approval and landowners may have been contacted and are likely to allow work to be done. | 2 | Medium |
| Project does require landowner approval but landowner willingness is unknown | 0 | Low |
| **5. Support Local Values:**  |  |  |
| Sponsor provides high level of documented support from local social, economic, and cultural groups and/or identified in adopted plans and policies. | 3 | High |
| Suggested support or benefits, but not quantified. | 2 | Medium |
| There is no mention or connection of the project to local values, or may be in conflict in with local values, adopted plans and policies. | 0 | Low |

## Cost

(Maximum value is 100%. The percentage value for this weighting factor is calculated by adding all of the scores assigned to the project and then dividing by the total possible score for the category. Weighting factors adjust the Overall Effectiveness score)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1**. **Budget and Cost Effectiveness**  | Score  | Assessment |
| The budget is detailed and clearly explained. Has a low cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in that location. Sponsor has 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). | 15 | High |
| The budget is detailed and clearly explained. Has a reasonable cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in that location. However, the project does not fully take advantage of resource leveraging to reduce costs and maximize benefits. | 14 | Medium |
| The budget is detailed and clearly explained. Has a high cost relative to the predicted benefits for that particular project type in that location. | 13 | Low |