

**Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) 2017 Grant Round
Snohomish River Basin (WRIA 7)
Lead Entity Evaluation Criteria and Scoring**

Criteria: Benefit to Salmon

General guidance: All projects must be consistent with the scientific foundation of the Snohomish River Basin Salmon Conservation Plan, including the Ecological Analysis of Salmon Conservation (EASC) appendix and updated protection strategies found in the Snohomish Basin Protection Plan. Projects or project types that are not specifically identified as priorities in the Conservation Plan documents must clearly demonstrate consistency with the scientific principles and action recommendations in the plan.

Category	Project Evaluation Criteria
(1) Watershed Processes and Habitat Features	<p><u>All projects:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addresses high priority habitat features and/or watershed processes that significantly influence salmonid productivity in the basin. • Addresses causes, not symptoms. • Has a broad geographic effect on a process or area rather than a specific site. <p><u>Restoration project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restores watershed processes and associated habitat features that are known to significantly limit productivity of priority species and populations in the basin. • Restores habitat or watershed processes rather than replaces a missing structural element. <p><u>Acquisition project (of land, access, rights):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protects areas with intact habitat processes and high quality habitat • Note: If less than 60% of habitat is intact, project <u>must</u> be a combination project that includes restoration. • If project includes restoration, the restoration phase is expected to be complete within 5 years. If acquisition is part of a series of acquisitions necessary to advance a large-scale project, the project may receive full points even if restoration may occur beyond the 5-year timeframe, provided the sponsor clearly outlines the pathway and vision for the project and aligns it with the scale of Plan activities. <p><u>Non-capital project (assessment, design, inventory, effectiveness monitoring, study):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project is crucial to understanding watershed processes, is directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will clearly lead to new projects that address high priority habitat features and/or watershed processes.

<p>(2) Areas and Actions</p>	<p><u>All projects:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follows the ecological action priorities outlined for the Nearshore, Estuary, Mainstem – primary restoration, or Headwaters-primary protection sub-basin strategy groups, the sequence rank in the 3-year Work Plan, and referenced in the EASC Step 6 Table 6-1 (Ecological Analysis for Salmonid Conservation Appendix). <p><u>Restoration project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restoration actions focused on identified limiting factors for listed species. • Targets high-priority restoration actions in the Nearshore, Estuary or Mainstem – primary restoration sub-basin strategy groups. • For projects not located in the Nearshore, Estuary or Mainstem – primary restoration sub-basin strategy groups, project targets highest priority actions identified for the applicable strategy group. <p><u>Acquisition project (of land, access, rights):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acquisition of specific target parcel(s) has been identified as a high priority action in a previous assessment. • The acquisition will occur in high-priority protection areas as identified in the Plan, such as Headwaters Primary Protection sub-basin strategy group or intact areas within the Nearshore, Estuary and Mainstem Primary Restoration sub-basin strategy groups; or, the acquisition will occur in high-priority restoration areas as identified in the Plan, such as Nearshore, Estuary or Mainstem primary restoration sub-basins, and will contribute to implementation of a critical restoration project. <p><u>Non-capital project (assessment, design, inventory, effectiveness monitoring, study):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fills a high priority data gap identified in Chapter 12 and Appendix O. • Implements a recommended protection action as outlined in Appendix B of the Snohomish Basin Protection Plan • Clearly informs protection or restoration strategy refinement and/or project development in high priority areas.
<p>(3) Species</p>	<p><u>All projects:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project is a high priority for one or more ESA-listed species and benefits multiple species or distinct populations of salmonids. • Benefits to non-listed species emphasize populations primarily supported by natural spawning. • Use of area by target species or populations has been documented. <p><u>Restoration project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the case of barrier removals, use of area by target species or populations is highly likely based on documented habitat conditions and proximity of occupied habitat.

(4) Life History	<p><u>All projects:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addresses an important life history stage or habitat type that limits the productivity of listed salmonid species in the area and/or project addresses multiple life history requirements.
(5) Costs	<p><u>All projects:</u></p> <p>Has a low cost relative to the predicted benefits for that project type in that location.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs seem reasonable for the project Habitat benefits for the cost are specific Budget has reasonable detail to ensure understanding of the elements of the project and what outputs result from the grant.

Benefit to Salmon Categories	Category Scoring (0-5)	Multiplier	Total Possible Points (100)
Watershed Process and Habitat Features	5= high	7	35
Areas and Actions	4	5	25
Species	3= medium	3	15
Life History	2	3	15
Costs	1= low 0	2	10

Criteria: Certainty of Success

Category	Project Evaluation Criteria
(1) Appropriate	<p>Project is consistent with Section 2 of SRFB Policy Manual (applicant and project eligibility). Scope is complete and appropriate to meet its goals and objectives [see SRFB guidance for Restoration, Acquisition and Non-Capital (i.e., Assessment, Design, Inventory, Study) project types]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has clearly stated project hypothesis, goals and objectives.
(2) Approach	<p><u>Restoration project:</u></p> <p>Is consistent with proven scientific methods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scope, methods, and materials are appropriate in scale and complexity to efficiently accomplish the work • Other approaches and opportunities were considered • Most appropriate approach is proposed <p><u>Acquisition project (of land, access, rights):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal clearly describes why project goals and objectives are best achieved through acquisition in place of other actions. <p><u>Non-capital project (assessment, design, inventory, study, protection implementation):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Methodology effectively addresses a high-priority information/data gap that clearly limits project identification or development, or • Leads to effective implementation of prioritized projects within one-to-two years of completion, or • Directly leads to a conceptual, preliminary or final design (deliverable).
(3) Sequence	<p><u>Restoration project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is in the correct sequence and is independent of other actions being taken first. • Ecological value of restoration largely independent of other actions. • Builds on previous work <p><u>Acquisition project (of land, access, rights):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed acquisition is a high priority relative to other potential acquisitions by same entity. • Ecological value of acquisition is largely independent of other actions. • If site restoration is required following acquisition (but not proposed as part of a combination acquisition/restoration project), the likely prioritization, timeframe, and funding sources for proposed restoration activities are clearly described.

	<p><u>Non-capital project (assessment, design, inventory, effectiveness monitoring, study):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a necessary precursor to future restoration or protection actions. • There are no known major barriers to subsequent capital project implementation.
(4) Threat	<p><u>Restoration project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project alleviates imminent threat(s) to habitat-forming processes. <p><u>Acquisition project (of land, access, rights):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of the property is imminent (within 1-5 years). <p><u>Non-capital project (assessment, design, inventory, effectiveness monitoring, study):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informs project development, addresses high priority data gap or provides specific protection action where threats to habitat are imminent.
(5) Stewardship	<p><u>Restoration project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearly describes and funds stewardship of the area or facility for >10 years. • Self-sustaining or requires low maintenance • Monitoring plan or plan outline is related to project objectives • Funding for monitoring and maintenance is identified <p><u>Acquisition project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long term responsibility and funding for stewardship of site is secure. <p><u>Non-capital project (assessment, design, inventory, study, protection implementation):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not considered for this type of project
(6) Landowner	<p><u>Restoration project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowner(s) is willing to have proposed work done. <p><u>Acquisition project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landowner(s) willingness to sell is documented. <p><u>Non-capital project (assessment, design, inventory, effectiveness monitoring, study):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If an assessment/acquisition combination project, determination of landowner willingness is a project deliverable. • If a design project, landowner is willing to follow through with construction, pending final designs. • If an assessment, inventory or study, landowner willingness for access to perform project (if required) has been secured.

(7) Implementation	<p>If awarded SRFB grant, actions are scheduled, fully funded, and ready to take place and have few or no known constraints to successful implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sponsor is fully qualified to do the work. • Sponsor clearly identifies how any constraints, uncertainties, possible problems, delays or unanticipated expenses will be addressed and their likely impact on the project. • Project includes an adaptive management approach that provides for contingency planning.
(8) Public Involvement	<p>Involving the public is a key component of successful projects. The Forum recognizes the need for building a long-term involved public, with a conservation ethic. Further, projects must collaboratively involve surrounding landowners, key partners and the general public, if the recovery effort, and individual projects, is to effectively and efficiently use salmon recovery dollars.</p> <p><u>Stewardship and conservation ethic:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotes a conservation ethic by increasing the understanding and need for healthy watersheds, and salmon conservation and recovery. • Helps to foster stewardship in the local community by including educational signage, or other methods that increase public awareness and “ownership” of the project. • Works cooperatively with private landowners to provide technical assistance, incentives and/or cost sharing to promote innovative conservation solutions. <p><u>Involvement of key constituencies in shaping and executing the project:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates knowledge of the land and aquatic uses in the area (agriculture, drainage, infrastructure, recreation, etc.), and how to effect a positive outcome with these users. • Clearly understands: a) what constituencies must be engaged, b) why they must be engaged, and c) what agreements and outcomes must be in place. • By the time of application, has engaged surrounding landowners and key constituencies (e.g., diking district where the project is located) to the extent possible. Outlines when and how these constituencies will be engaged throughout the process; including all phases of the project and particularly the phase under consideration for funding.
(9) Basin Coordination	<p>Recovery is a coordinated effort. The Snohomish Basin is recognized for its high level of collaboration among partners. Sponsors need to demonstrate their coordination with other partners and filling gaps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Builds capacity and support for Plan implementation by providing for collaboration between governments, tribes, non-profits and/or the local community. Helps partners or others in Plan implementation. Works within a priority sub-basin with other partners, or fills a gap. • Fosters alliances with other groups in the basin, such as the Forum, Project Working Group, other sponsors or community organizations. Improves networks by engaging multiple organizations and

	<p>communities in project implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinates with appropriate partners to integrate with related local or regional conservation efforts. • Maximizes Plan efficiency by effectively leveraging matching funding and/or resources and partnerships. Demonstrates more match than the minimum required (e.g. 25%).
(10) Cultural Values and Working Lands	<p>Projects proposed on working lands (agriculture, forestry) or used for cultural purposes (including tribal cultural, recreation, etc.) are important uses to balance with salmon recovery goals. Projects must demonstrate how these lands and constituencies are considered partners and how such values are incorporated into the design and implementation of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponent demonstrates a positive working relationship with the user community (farmers, foresters, recreational users) that balances salmon recovery with supporting viable working landscapes and cultural values. Proponent clearly identifies the steps they will implement to accomplish this. • Provides technical assistance, cost sharing and/or recognition of land use partners. Promotes the use of incentive programs to assist in protecting existing habitat and implementing restoration. • Maintains or increases public access or recreational opportunities. • Protects public health, safety and water quality by reducing flood risk and property damage, and/or by restoring ecosystem function that benefits public health or safety. • Increases the availability of traditional and cultural plant materials to maintain cultural needs and support biological and genetic diversity. See Appendix N of the Plan for a list of example species.

Restoration

Certainty of Success Categories	Category Scoring	Multiplier	Total Possible Points (100)
Appropriate	5= high	3	15
Approach	4	3	15
Sequence	3= medium	3	15
Threat	2	3	15
Stewardship	1= low	2	10
Landowner	0	2	10
Implementation		1	5
Public Involvement	1=low – 7=high	1	7
Basin Coordination	1=low – 3=high	1	3
Cultural Values and Working Lands	1=low – 5=high	1	5

Acquisition

Certainty of Success Categories	Category Scoring	Multiplier	Total Possible Points (100)
Appropriate	5= high	3	15
Approach	4	2	10
Sequence	3= medium	3	15
Threat	2	3	15
Stewardship	1= low	3	15
Landowner	0	2	10
Implementation		1	5
Public Involvement	1=low - 7=high	1	7
Basin Coordination	1=low - 3=high	1	3
Cultural Values and Working Lands	1=low - 5=high	1	5

Non-Capital

Certainty of Success Categories	Category Scoring	Multiplier	Total Possible Points (100)
Appropriate	5= high	3	15
Approach	4	4	20
Sequence	3= medium	4	20
Threat	2	3	15
Stewardship	1= low		
Landowner	0	2	10
Implementation		1	5
Public Involvement	1=low - 7=high	1	7
Basin Coordination	1=low - 3=high	1	3
Cultural Values and Working Lands	1=low - 5=high	1	5

Scoring Guidance

- Benefit and certainty categories will be scored based on the definitions explained in the previous section.
- Each project will have two scores (one benefit, one certainty, not a combined score)
- Projects will be scored on a **whole number** (e.g., a project must receive a score of 3 or 4, not 3.5) scale from 1-7. 7 is the highest score and is outlined in the criteria above.
- All reviewers will score all projects. Scores are draft and to be used for discussion during the project sub-committee scoring meeting.
- Project proposals will be sent to each reviewer but reviewers will meet to discuss and score projects together. Scoring as a group will help disperse the various pieces of knowledge and biases that each individual brings regarding individual projects and understanding of criteria.
- Because the Plan does not differentiate between acquisition or restoration, no preference shall be given according to project type, so long as it follows the recommendations for the Sub-basin Strategy Group in which the project is located.
- All categories will be given a multiplier based on their relative importance as listed in the tables above.
- Guidelines to break ties (for committee consideration and discussion):
 - Lower cost to SRFB to higher salmon benefit ratio
 - Higher percent match
 - Vote
- Sponsors must address the Local Project Review Subcommittee and SRFB Review Panel comments in their Salmon Project Proposal (a.k.a., narrative), attached in PRISM Online using “track changes”. Sponsors must only address the comments directly in the proposal; other changes will not be accepted.