|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Guidance - All Project Types** | **Barrier-specific detail** | **Acquisition-specific detail** | **Assessment-specific detail** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **Overall Benefit** | |  |  |  |  |  |
| **1) Critical Need** | **Does the proposal address a threat to salmonid habitat and clearly articulate how the threat will be addressed?** | | | |  |  |
|  | **1a) Does the proposal identify an imminent or existing threat to important salmonid habitat that will be addressed?**  (max 2 pts) | "Threat" is the existing threat of the barrier. | Examples of imminent threat: subdivisions/ conversions /planned timber harvest/ Loss of native vegetation/ runoff |  | 2 |  |
|  | **1b) Does the proposal clearly articulate how the action will address the threat?** (max 2 pts) |  | Examples: Protection of project site will prevent habitat fragmentation, degradation / contamination of salmonid habitat |  | 2 |  |
|  | **1c) Is the proposed action cited in or supported by adopted conservation and recovery plans, habitat assessments or other relevant documentation?** (max 2 pts) | Examples: Lead Entity ranked barrier list, WDFW barrier assessments, EDT | Sponsor provides documentation of relevant plan |  | 2 |  |
| **2) Species** | **Will the project protect or restore habitat for multiple salmonid species and/or unique populations?** | | | |  |  |
|  | **2a) Does the project protect or restore habitat for multiple salmon species or unique populations?** |  | Does the project protect habitat for multiple salmon species or unique populations? |  |  |  |
|  | 4 or more species get high (max 4 pts) The proposal must demonstrate that these species will actually benefit from the project. Also high points for fewer species but unique populations (4 pts) |  |  | 4 |  |
|  | 3 species get up to (3 pts) 2 species get up to (2 pts) and 1 species 1 pt. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **2b) Has fish use been documented?** |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fish use has been documented through habitat assessment, SWIFD, or other data source (2 pts) Only modelled/ unconfirmed anadromous salmonids use (1 point). (0 pts) if no documented fish use |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| **Criteria** | **Guidance - All Project Types** | **Barrier-specific additional detail** | **Acquisition-specific additional detail** | **Assessment-specific additional detail** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **3) Life History Benefits** | **Will the project benefit multiple life history stages and/or address limiting life stages?** | | | |  |  |
| Addresses a life history that is limited in the system and/or Addresses multiple life stages for multiple species - points commensurate with species. (6 pts) | Example: Provides access to habitat for a limited life stage | Example. Protects a limiting life stage through a habitat type such as an oxbow or side channel | Example. Provides information on habitat use for a poorly understood life-stage | 6 |  |
| Addresses one life history for each species (4 pts) Addresses one life history, but quality and expected fish use is low (2 pts) |  |  |  |  |  |
| It is unclear about the salmonid life history being addressed. (0 pts) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4) Watershed Processes and Habitat Features** | **Does the project protect or restore high-priority habitat features and/or watershed processes?** | | | |  |  |
| Consider if habitat is well defined and how habitats benefit salmon. Consider overall habitat connectivity and watershed processes in the context of a functioning habitat system. High priority can be determined many ways. Consider processes "that significantly protect or limit the salmonid productivity in the area." For restoration projects, consider whether the project addresses the root causes of degradation. | **4a)** Does the project correct a high priority barrier that limits salmonid productivity, as determined by being in the top 30% of LE ranked list, PI >15, or similar? (max 3 pts) | **4a)** The proposal clearly describes the habitat types, habitat conditions and processes associated with the areas proposed for protection and how habitat benefit salmon (max 3 pts) | Crucial to understanding watershed processes, is directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will clearly lead to new projects in high priority areas. (5-6 pts) | 3 |  |
|  |  | **4b)** Does the project open good quality habitat for salmon? Is that habitat well defined? (max 2 pts) | **4b)** The proposal explains how the project boundaries were determined and why protection of the entire project area is necessary (max 2 pts) | Will lead to new projects in moderate priority areas and is independent of other key conditions being addressed first.(3-4 pts) | 2 |  |
|  |  | **4c)** Does the design allow for restoring natural processes? (max 1 pts) | **4c)** The proposal clearly identifies the boundaries and scope of the area proposed for protection (max 1 pt) | Has not been proven to address an important habitat condition in the area. (0) | 1 |  |
| **Criteria** | **Guidance - All Project Types** | **Barrier-specific additional detail** | **Acquisition-specific additional detail** | **Assessment-specific additional detail** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **5) High Priority Areas and Actions** | **Does the proposal address a high priority action in a high-priority geographic area?** | | | |  |  |
| **5a) Is the project a high priority action? (max 4 pts)** |  |  |  | 4 |  |
| 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. | Addresses Tier 1 concern or similar (max 4 pts). | Addresses Tier 1 concern or similar (max 4 pts) | Fills an important data gap (max 4 pts) |  |  |
|  | **5b) Is the project in a high priority area? (2 pts max)** |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | Since High Priority areas have not been determined by the Lead Entity, in the near term, we are looking at assigning an extra point to projects in the Newaukum to accelerate restoration in that subwatershed. | (2 pts max) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Assign 0 of 2 points here if project occurs in degraded watershed |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6) Quantity of Benefit** | **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?** | | | |  |  |
|  | *Habitat gain determined based on distance to next upstream total barrier or end of fish use. Consider distance to next upstream partial barrier in scoring.* | *Functioning habitat examples: Intact nearshore/estuarine complexes/ Intact wetland/riparian/forested complexes* |  | 6 |  |
|  |  | >5 miles of quality habitat is considered High (6 pts) | The proposed acquisition protects large, functioning habitat systems and processes and these are adequately quantified (6 pts) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 4.01 – 5 miles (5 pts)  3.01 – 4 miles (4 pts) 2.01 – 3 miles (3 pts) | Protects important habitat that is an integral part of a larger intact system or area proposed for protection.(4 pts) |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1.01 miles to 2 miles upstream (2 pts) - 0 to 1 mile upstream (1 pts) | Protects habitat that is not necessarily essential to the function of a larger system or to sustaining important processes. (0-2 pts) |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Guidance - All Project Types** | **Barrier-specific additional detail** | **Acquisition-specific additional detail** | **Assessment-specific additional detail** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **7) Synergy with Other Actions** | **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?** | | | |  |  |
| High points if the project is part of an explicitly strategic approach. Examples include multiple sponsors working together on project development to meet larger habitat goals. | Example of agencies/sponsor working together in a subbasin or stream reach– RMAP, NRCS, FFFPP culverts, etc. | Proposal builds on prior investment and is part of a strategic approach to achieving sub-basin and Chehalis habitat protection and restoration goals. Examples include effective relationship or coordination with other restoration, land acquisitions (max 6 pts) |  | 6 |  |
|  | Medium points if there are near-by synergistic projects not identified by sponsor and not part of a coordinated effort, but which are known about by committee. |  | Project is a strategic component of a new initiative and the sponsor has articulated a vision for future investment and actions. (max 4 pts) |  |  |  |
|  | No linkage with other restoration or protection actions (0 pts) |  | Does the proposal seek to invest SRFB funds in a stand-alone or primarily “opportunistic” transaction? If so, 0 points. |  |  |  |
| **Certainty of Benefits** | |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Guidance - All Project Types** | **Barrier-specific additional detail** | **Acquisition-specific additional detail** | **Assessment-specific additional detail** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **8) Approach/ Science Based** | **Is the proposed action consistent with proven scientific methods?** | |  |  |  |  |
| 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. | Follows WDFW guidance about Stream Crossings. Requires limited maintenance, works with natural ecosystem processes, is self-sustaining, considers water quality and quantity issues. Designs for how the project site could be impacted by climate change (3pts) | The proposal clearly articulates how targeted species, life stages and habitats will be protected and provides a detailed estimate of stewardship/legal defense costs and funding sources. (3 pts) | Methodology will effectively address a data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within one to two years of completion. (3 pts) | 3 |  |
|  | Medium points if activities are based on scientific methods that may have been tested but the results are incomplete. |  | The proposal lacks either a sound approach for protecting targeted species and habitats or an adequate plan for ensuring future stewardship and legal defense. (2 pts) | Methods will effectively address a data gap or lead to effective implementation of prioritized projects within three to five years of completion. (up to 2 pts) |  |  |
|  | Low points if uses methods that have not been tested or proven to be effective in the past. Uses outdated or problematic methods. | For construction projects, 0 points if no design provided: projects need to have a design included so reviewers can know if they are consistent with scientific methods. | The proposal lacks both a sound approach for protecting targeted species and habitats and an adequate plan for ensuring future stewardship and legal defense. (0-1 pts) |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Guidance - All Project Types** | **Barrier-specific additional detail** | **Acquisition-specific additional detail** | **Assessment-specific additional detail** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **9) Clear Goals and Objectives** | **Does the proposal include quantifiable actions, goals and SMART\* objectives? "SMART" = specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound** | | | |  |  |
| For full points, follows RCO guidance on what makes a “SMART” project. (3 pts) |  |  |  | 3 |  |
|  | Actions, goals and objectives are adequately described but not fully quantifiable (2 pts) | Project sponsor hasn’t mapped the stream, unknown miles opened; project not measurable/hasn’t been measured. (2 pts) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Poorly articulated goals lead to low points. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **10) Scope** | **Is the project scope appropriate to meet its goals and objectives?** | | | |  |  |
|  | 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. |  | Consider: Primary threats to sensitive habitat areas are often from conversion/ intensive use of adjacent upland areas. It’s often unrealistic to acquire priority habitat areas only (landowner likely unwilling to sell or protect riparian area only) |  | 3 |  |
|  | Medium points when there isn’t enough information about how the project would meet its goals. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Low points when the methodology does not appear to cover all project elements necessary to develop, implement, and complete the project. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Low if the project doesn't address an underlying problem |  |  |  |  |  |
| **11) Budget and Cost Effectiveness** | **Is the project budget realistic and does it contain sufficient detail? Is the project cost-effective?** | | | |  |  |
|  | **19a) Does** the proposal’s budget provide sufficient detail to determine whether or not projected expenses are realistic to achieve the project’s stated goals (Max 1 pt) |  | The proposal should explain how cost estimates were developed and how the value of property to be acquired will be determined. (Ex. appraisal process) |  | 1 |  |
|  | **19b)** Does the project have a low cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in that location? (Max 2 pts) | For full points, costs are comparable with similar projects being done in similar areas on similar land ownerships. | The proposal should articulate how outright acquisition or conservation easement is the most cost effective approach. |  | 2 |  |
|  | **19c)** 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. Needs to provide more than 15% required match to get high points here. (Max2 pts) | Match above and beyond the requirements to get high points | Project significantly leverages “match” funding for full points. | Match above and beyond the requirements to get high points | 3 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Ability to Implement** | |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Guidance - All Project Types** | **Barrier-specific additional detail** | **Acquisition-specific additional detail** | **Assessment-specific additional detail** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **12) Team Experience** | **Does the project sponsor have a demonstrated ability to complete projects as proposed, on time and according to budget?** | | | |  |  |
| 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. |  | **11a)** Does the sponsor have the demonstrated ability to complete projects as proposed, as budgeted and within the stated timeframe? (2 pts) |  | **3** |  |
|  | Project sponsor or team members have experience successfully managing or implementing at least one project similar to the one proposed (2 pts) |  | **11b)** Does the sponsor have the demonstrated ability to build and lead multi-stakeholder partnerships that achieve stated goals? (add 1 point) |  |  |  |
|  | Project sponsor and team members lack experience conducting work similar to the proposed action. (0 pts) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **13) Schedule/ Sequence** | **Does the proposal include a logical sequence of actions and is the milestone schedule realistic?** | | | |  |  |
| 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. | For high points, the project is occurring in the correct sequence relative to any upstream or downstream project. |  |  | 3 |  |
|  | Low points if schedule is unclear or is in the wrong sequence with other protection and restoration actions.  -Low points if other projects need to be completed before the benefits to fish will be realized  -Projects receive (1) point if the source of match was unsecure. -No points (0) if schedule is unrealistic or unreasonable | Example of low scoring projects: downstream barrier with no plans to be addressed, etc. |  |  |  |  |
| **14) Permits** | **Are permits required for the project to proceed? If yes, what is the status of permit approval and is the permitting plan/schedule reasonable?** | | | |  |  |
|  | No permits are needed or the permitting plan/schedule is reasonable and the status of existing permits or permitting applications is known (3 pts) | For design-only projects: The sponsor’s schedule needs to include a list of expected needed permits and a reasonable timeline submitting applications. |  | Permits are generally not needed for assessments. (3 pts) in this category | 3 |  |
|  | Medium if permits are needed but the permitting plan/schedule has some resolvable uncertainty about the process or date permits will be obtained | For design-only projects: lists which permits are needed, but not a schedule. |  |  |  |  |
|  | Permits are needed but permitting plan/schedule is not feasible (0-1 pts) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Guidance - All Project Types** | **Barrier-specific additional detail** | **Acquisition-specific additional detail** | **Assessment-specific additional detail** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **15) Landowners** | **Do the participating and affected landowners support the project?** | | | | 3 |  |
|  | For full points, Proposal acknowledges that landowners are informed of the risks associated with the project and are supportive of the proposal OR there are no known risks and or/ the stakeholders are very familiar with the scope of the project. -Documented evidence that there is permission to move forward (signed willingness form, or similar) -If neighboring landowners are affected by the project, support is documented. |  | The sponsor and landowner have demonstrated one of the following: a Signed Purchase & 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) |  |  |  |
|  | Medium points if landowner acknowledgment form is signed.  Proposals acknowledges some potential risks and that the landowner is aware |  | The landowner has provided a signed statement acknowledging their awareness of the funding proposal on their property. (2 pts) |  |  |  |
|  | Low (1) points if no landowner acknowledgement form. -No (0) points when the review team knows that there was unwillingness or hesitancy by landowner to have the work done. -Proposal does not indicate that landowner has been informed of any risks associated with the project |  | The sponsor has not provided any evidence of landowner acknowledgment or support (0 pts) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Guidance - All Project Types** | **Barrier-specific additional detail** | **Acquisition-specific additional detail** | **Assessment-specific additional detail** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **16) Support Local Values** | **Does the proposal demonstrate a high level of support from local stakeholders (i.e. social, economic, and cultural groups, and/or identified in adopted plans and policies)?** | | | |  |  |
|  | Needs to actually document support to get full points (examples: an adopted plan or policy, letter of support, 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. |  |  |  | 3 |  |
|  | Medium points if the sponsor describes the type of support for the project without documenting a plan, policy, letter of support, or some other source. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Low (1) points if there is no mention of local values -No (0) points if the review team knows of a conflict with local values the project sponsor has not mentioned -Project may generate concerns for agricultural community, recreation community, or Tribal communities  -Project provides little or no benefit to basin economy. |  |  |  |  |  |
| **17) Education and Outreach** | **Will the project incorporate a long-term education/outreach program? Will the project foster a community conservation ethic through citizen involvement?** | | | |  |  |
|  | 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) |  |  |  | 4 |  |
|  | 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). (2-3 pts) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Project does not incorporate any education component. (0) |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Criteria** | **Guidance - All Project Types** | **Barrier-specific additional detail** | **Acquisition-specific additional detail** | **Assessment-specific additional detail** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **18) Partnerships** | **Will the project benefit from a diverse, multi-stakeholder partnership? Does the proposal significantly leverage limited salmon recovery funding?”** | | | |  |  |
|  | The project has documented multiple partners (3+) 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, etc. (3-4 pts) |  |  |  | 4 |  |
|  | The project has 1-2 partnerships with less defined commitments and no long-term involvement. (2 pts) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | No partnerships. (0 pts) |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Total Score** |  |  |  |  | **80** |  |