2022 Request for Proposals

Cooperative Watershed Management Grant Program

Monitoring and Assessments

Snoqualmie & South Fork Skykomish Watersheds
(King County portion of Water Resource Inventory Area 7)

Snoqualmie Watershed Forum

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview

The Snoqualmie Watershed Forum (Forum) Cooperative Watershed Management (CWM) Grant program supports monitoring and assessment projects along the Snoqualmie and South Fork (SF) Skykomish watersheds and their tributaries within the King County portion of WRIA 7.

The Forum is a committed partner of non-profit corporations (501(c)3 status), tribal governments, local governments (City, County), Conservation Districts, and other interested parties that seek to help improve conditions for salmon and water quality in the Snoqualmie and SF Skykomish watersheds.

This fund supports monitoring and assessment projects with an emphasis on Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed salmonids (Chinook salmon, steelhead trout, bull trout).

How much funding is available for the 2022 CWM Grant round?

The Forum anticipates $298,500 being available for monitoring and assessment projects in the Snoqualmie and SF Skykomish watersheds in 2022. The minimum grant award is $7,500. While there is no maximum grant award, all funding requests will be asked if the proposed project is scalable (i.e. can the project be phased over space and time?).

Which types of monitoring projects are eligible to apply?

Overview

The 2005 Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Plan discusses three types of monitoring (see Chapter 12 in the Plan [page 12-4, page 236 of PDF] for more details):

- *Implementation monitoring:* Did we implement the Plan's projects, programs and policies as intended? (For individual projects, implementation monitoring asks if the project was built as planned, and if not, what changes took place during implementation?)

- *Effectiveness monitoring:* Did individual projects perform as expected (direct effectiveness) and have all the activities combined improved habitat conditions as expected (cumulative effectiveness, also sometimes called status and trends)?

- *Validation monitoring*: What overall effects have habitat plan implementation actions had on the Snoqualmie/SF Skykomish Chinook salmon viable salmonid populations (VSP) parameters, and are the technical assumptions within the Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Plan accurate?

In 2022, this Request for Proposals (RFP) is soliciting proposals for:

- **Enhanced Direct Project Effectiveness Monitoring** *(not routine effectiveness monitoring—see distinction below)*

- **Cumulative Effectiveness Monitoring**
- **Validation Monitoring**
- **Ongoing Research and Data Gaps**

See Chapter 12 in the 2005 Plan (page 12-1, page 243 of PDF) and Appendix O (page 341 of PDF) for examples of monitoring questions a proposal might focus on.

What is Enhanced Direct Project Effectiveness Monitoring[1]?

Enhanced monitoring is focused on understanding how Chinook and other juvenile salmonids are using restoration projects. Unlike routine effectiveness monitoring, which asks whether a certain type of habitat was created and sustained by a specific project, enhanced effectiveness monitoring is meant to determine how fish use the habitat, and which restoration and enhancement / improvement techniques work best.

EXAMPLES:

- What factors determine if restoration projects are contributing to higher growth rates (and thus survival) of juvenile Chinook?
- Are juvenile Chinook using backwater habitats in the Snoqualmie River, and if so, at what times and under what flows?
- Assess juvenile Chinook use of large wood structures; What characteristics of wood structures are driving abundance and use?

Not eligible in 2022:

- Implementation monitoring

  Why is implementation monitoring not eligible?
  Inclusion of funding for three years of basic project-level implementation monitoring is a requirement for all Restoration & Protection and Riparian projects, and will not be funded through the program's Monitoring and Assessment allocation.

- Routine (e.g., habitat-focused) direct effectiveness monitoring (see distinction from enhanced, direct effectiveness monitoring)

  Why is routine direct effectiveness monitoring not eligible?
  Although routine project effectiveness monitoring is not a requirement for Restoration & Protection and Riparian projects, it is encouraged; however, we are not soliciting proposals to fund this work through this RFP because with limited funds to allocate,

[1] The distinction between 'enhanced' and 'routine' direct effectiveness monitoring does not appear in the 2005 Salmon Plan; it is a useful concept borrowed from WRIA 9's Monitoring and Adaptive Management Plan and their CWM Monitoring & Assessment RFP.

we believe it is more important to allocate monitoring dollars to more direct measurements of fish use of projects.

- Knowledge exchanges (eligible under different grant category)

  Knowledge exchange proposals (e.g. plan, convene, and host a targeted science and policy conference that facilitates discussions of monitoring and assessments results relevant to the Snoqualmie and SF Skykomish watersheds) are encouraged, but will be reviewed, scored, and funded under the Education and Outreach allocation. You can find that RFP on the Forum's website.

What is a Priority Research Gap in WRIA 7?

The Salmon Habitat Plan is grounded in best available science and filling known data gaps is a priority for ensuring effective management and implementation of the Plan. Chapter 12 in the 2005 Salmon Plan describes some of the priority questions, while Appendix O covers these as well as second and third tier priority topics that were discussed and prioritized by the Technical Committee. While not exhaustive, these may be used as a starting place by the applicant. Since 2005 many data gaps have been addressed or at least partially addressed through various studies. However, as is typical with research, for every question answered many more new questions are created; our list of data or knowledge gaps has expanded as new issues have emerged. There have been many reports with recommendations for additional research. Newer reports that compiled and described many new research needs include the Plan Update white paper on temperature (Kubo et al. 2021; see 'Future Research' chapter, starting on p.69) and a King County report on project effectiveness monitoring (Kubo et al. 2021b). See the Forum's website ("Plans, Studies, and Maps") for a list of additional reports published since 2005 (not exhaustive).

While the above resources document many opportunities for future research, they are not exhaustive and there are likely many knowledge gaps that could be addressed through this funding source. This funding is also available to support studies that seek to more fully address previously funded or existing research. Proposals that can demonstrate a tie to a previously documented research gap or need, such as those in the original Plan or the reports listed above, are eligible; however, proposals to study emerging issues not previously documented are also eligible if they can make a strong case for the need to fill the data gap and how it will advance the goals of the Salmon Plan.

EXAMPLES:

- How do salmonids distribute themselves throughout the summer season and on a daily basis? Do certain species or life history types seek out certain types of thermal refuges?
- Why do some tributaries remain cool even in years of low flow and high air temperatures, while others of similar size do not?

Who can apply?

Applicants must be one of the following: cities, towns, special purpose districts, public schools, King County, state agencies, federally recognized tribes, and private non-profit organizations (501(c)3 status) are eligible. Individuals and for-profit businesses are not eligible.

What is the Grant Round Timeline?

Dates	Action
November 18, 2021	Grant round opens
January 24, 2022	*Deadline* Notice of Intent to Apply submission due (submit via the online portal).
March 21, 2022	*Deadline* Final Application due (submit via the online portal).
March 22 – May 6, 2022	Application Review, Project Presentations, Project Ranking
May 18, 2022	Snoqualmie Watershed Forum Approval of Grants
Summer / Fall 2022	King County Flood Control District (FCD) Executive Committee Approval of CWM Grants

Following the Summer / Fall FCD meeting, project sponsors will be contacted by King County for contracting. Funding is available after approval and following a signed contract agreement.

What is the review process?

The review process includes a two-step process (see *How do I apply?* below): (1) Notice of Intent to Apply submission, and (2) Final Application.

A review team consisting of local technical experts and Forum partners will be convened to form the Project Review Committee. The Project Review Committee will independently evaluate and score proposals using the criteria outlined in the CWM program's Request for Proposals packets. If you submit a final application, you will be asked to provide a short project presentation to the Project Review Committee. Scores will be summed, and projects ranked based on their overall score (highest to lowest), how the project aligns with the Forum's CWM Grant Funding Priorities, and if there is consensus among the Project Review Committee.

The ranked list will then be presented to the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum for approval. If approved, the list will then be presented to the Flood Control District for final approval. Following the approval from the Flood Control District, project sponsors will be notified, and contract agreements will be initiated. Contact the Forum's Project Coordinator - Cory Zyla (czyla@kingcounty.gov) - if you have additional questions (please read packet in its entirety beforehand).

How do I apply?

To help save both applicants and reviewers time, the CWM grant program includes a 2-step process:

1. **Notice of Intent to Apply (NOI)**

   Documentation required:

   1. Complete online NOI form by 11:59 PM on Monday, January 24, 2022.
   2. Submit the following documents via e-mail to the Forum's Project Coordinator: Cory Zyla, czyla@kingcounty.gov:
      a. CWM Budget Table (MS Excel spreadsheet)
      b. Project site map (MS Word, PDF, image files).

2. **Final Application**

   Documentation required:

   1. Complete the online Final Application form.

   Submit the following documents via e-mail to the Forum's Project Coordinator: Cory Zyla, czyla@kingcounty.gov:

   2. Complete the King County Flood Control District 2022 Cooperative Watershed Management Grant Application form by 11:59 PM on Monday, March 21, 2022 (MS Word document).
   3. CWM Budget Table (MS Excel spreadsheet)
   4. Brief (<1 page) cover letter describing:
      a. An overview of your approach (2-3 sentences);
      b. Project's scalability (how can this project be phased, scope reduced or expanded);
      c. Any unique project attributes you would like to highlight for the review team.
   5. Project site map (MS Word, PDF, image files).
   6. Documentation of landowner support (required when working on property you do not own; not required if owned by project sponsor) (preferably a signed document, such as landowner agreement).
   7. A completed Supplemental Form: Monitoring and Assessments (MS Word).
   8. Detailed research plan (in .doc /.docx format).

***Project site photos are recommended, but not required.

If you experience any issues, please get in touch with Cory Zyla, Forum Project Coordinator at 206-263-8353 or czyla@kingcounty.gov.

Are there any prerequisites or conditions attached to this funding?

Yes. Monitoring and assessment projects must show a direct benefit to salmon habitat or water quality indicators that support salmon habitat. The project must be located within the Snoqualmie and/or the SF Skykomish watersheds. Additionally:

- The project must have a high certainty of success.
- Projects must be completed within three years of award.
- Applicants must have identified monitoring project areas on maps (provided with application)and should provide any available correspondence showing relevant landowner support for the potential project (re: any potential access issues).
- No elements supported by this award can be required as mitigation or other mandated activities[2].
- Project must demonstrate consistency with the WRIA 7 Salmon Habitat Plan.
- The project budget is realistic and accurately represents the project's expenses and revenue.
- Project must fully meet all CWM Policies.
- If requested, sponsor agrees to present their project at a mutually convenient Snoqualmie Valley Planning Committee, Snohomish Basin Salmon Recovery Technical Committee, or Snoqualmie Watershed Forum meeting.
- Sponsor must agree to acknowledge the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum and the King County Flood Control District for providing review and recommendation of your project for funding on all printed, online, and electronic documents; audio-visual materials; signs; or any other materials produced in association with an awarded grant.

[2] Grants can be used on mitigation projects to extend/increase monitoring beyond that required by regulatory permits.

Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

Use of Criteria in Ranking Process

Note that these criteria are simply an evaluation tool. The Project Review Committee will fully evaluate projects based on all provided information and will use group consensus to develop the final prioritized grant list.

- Final grant applications will be sent to reviewers to evaluate. Reviewers should score grants individually before the ranking meeting.
- Scores are draft and to be used for discussion purposes during the project review committee scoring meeting. Scoring as a group will help share technical knowledge of projects and limit biases.
- The Committee's final ranked list of grants will be forwarded to the Snoqualmie Watershed Forum for the final grant allocation decision.

Scoring Guidance

- Projects will be scored by category on a whole number scale (e.g., a project must receive a score of 1, 3, 5, not 1.5).
- Each project will have two scores (one benefit, one certainty, not a combined score)
- Scores are draft and to be used for discussion during the Project Review Committee's scoring meeting.
- Maximum points for Benefits to Salmon and Watershed Health = 100 points (note: a 60 point minimum is required to be considered for funding).
- Maximum points for Certainty of Success = 100 points (no minimum requirement).

Monitoring and Assessment: Scoring Criteria

Summary of Scoring Criteria

(1 = low; 3 = medium; 5 = high)

TECHNICAL MERIT

A *or* B*

***Proposals scored based on 1 of the following categories of monitoring:**

A. Enhanced Direct Project Effectiveness Monitoring *or*
B. Cumulative Effectiveness, Validation Monitoring, or Research Gaps.

(60 point minimum required to be considered for funding)

Criterion	***Guiding Question***	***Score***	***Multi-plier***	***Max Points***	***% of Total***
A. Enhanced Direct Project Effectiveness Monitoring					
Study Design and Methods	Are sampling methods and study design scientifically sound?	1,3,5	3	15	15%
Proposal Clarity	Does the proposal clearly articulate goals, objectives, and a hypothesis?	1,3,5	3	15	15%
Project Type: certainty of benefit	What is the certainty that the project being studied will benefit ESA-listed salmonids?	1,3,5	3.5	17.5	17.5%
Project type: structural vs. process based	Is the project subtype being studied process-based or structural?	1,3,5	3.5	17.5	17.5%
Commonness of project type	How common is the project type being studied? How many of this type are we likely to do in the next 10 to 20 years?	1,3,5	3.5	17.5	17.5%
Cost of project type being studied	How expensive is the project type being studied?	1,3,5	3.5	17.5	17.5%
			Total	**100**	**100%**
B. Cumulative Effectiveness, Validation Monitoring, or Research Gaps					
Study Design and Methods	Are sampling methods and study design scientifically sound?	1,3,5	3	15	15%
Proposal Clarity	Does the proposal clearly articulate goals, objectives, and a hypothesis?	1,3,5	3	15	15%

Relevance to Salmon Recovery in WRIA 7	Does the proposal fill a critical data gap or address an emerging issue that will help improve salmon recovery outcomes?	1,3,5	14	70	70%
			Total	**100**	**100%**

CERTAINTY OF SUCCESS (applies to ALL proposals)					
Criterion	***Guiding Question***	***Score***	***Multi-plier***	***Max Points***	***% of Total***
Monitoring Study / Assessment Cost	Are the costs reasonable for the type of work proposed?	1,3,5	4	**20**	20%
Community Involvement and Public Outreach	Is the study involving and/or engaging communities affected by the project?	1,3,5	4	**20**	20%
Sequence	Is the study in the correct sequence and independent of other actions being taken first?	1,3,5	4	**20**	20%
Feasibility and Readiness	Is the study feasible and ready to be implemented?	1,3,5	4	**20**	20%
Equity and Social Justice	Does the study reflect diversity, equity, and inclusion in the project design or implementation?	1,3,5	1	**5**	5%
Policy Impact	Does the proposal detail how policy might be impacted?	1,3,5	3	**15**	15%
			Total	**100**	**100%**

TECHNICAL MERIT

A *or* B* (100 points each)

***Proposals scored based on 1 of the following categories of monitoring:**

A. Enhanced Direct Project Effectiveness Monitoring *or*
B. Cumulative Effectiveness, Validation Monitoring, or Research Gaps.

60 point minimum for *Technical Merit* is required to be considered for funding.

Criteria	Description	Max Points
A. **Enhanced Direct Project Effectiveness Monitoring** Proposals		
Study Design and Methods	**Are sampling methods and study design scientifically sound?** • **High (5 points):** Uses proven scientific methods for sampling. Study design is thorough and well thought-out, including a plan for how the results will be statistically evaluated and what kind of inference will be possible with the results. • **Medium (3 points):** Uses methods that may have been tested but with incomplete or varying results. Study design is lacking in some regards. • **Low (1 point):** Uses sampling methods that have not been tested or proven to be effective in past uses. Study design is not thorough or well thought-out; does not think ahead to how results will be analyzed and what kind of inference will be possible with given study design. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	**15**
Proposal Clarity	**Does the proposal clearly articulate a hypothesis and include clear goals and objectives?** Proposals should clearly articulate goals and objectives (see this document for example of difference between a goal and objective). Objectives should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). Proposals should also include one or more specific hypotheses. • **High** (5 points): Proposal is clearly defined, identifies measurable goals and objectives. Hypotheses are clearly defined. • **Medium** (3 points): Proposal may not be completely clear, may lack one of the following:	**15**

	measurable goals, SMART objectives, or a clear hypothesis. • **Low** (1 point): Proposal is unclear and lacks one or more of the above requirements. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	
Project type being studied: certainty of benefit	**What is the certainty that the project type being studied will benefit salmonids, especially ESA-listed salmonids?** • **High (5):** A score of 5 indicates low certainty. Lower certainty indicates a weak scientific basis that the project type in that location will benefit ESA-listed salmonids. Where there is a weaker scientific basis, there is more need to verify the project's benefits. • **Medium (3):** A score of 3 indicates medium certainty • **Low (1):** A score of 1 indicates high certainty. Higher certainty indicates a strong scientific basis that the project type in that location will benefit ESA-listed salmonids. Where there is already a strong scientific basis, there is less need to verify the project's benefits. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	**17.5**
Project type being studied: structural vs. process based	**Is the project type being studied process-based or structural?** *(note: we have higher confidence in the benefits of process-based approaches, so we are generally more interested in studying and better understanding the benefits and drawbacks of different structural approaches)* • **High (5):** A score of 5 represents structural projects that add relatively static habitat features. The Plan generally favors process-based restoration techniques because there is greater certainty that the project will provide habitat benefits over the long term. Structural fixes tend to be engineered and more likely to fail in the long term. Thus, it is a higher priority to verify the benefits of those types of actions. • **Medium (3):** A score of 3 represents a relatively even mix of structural and process-based elements in the project(s) that the proposal plans to study. • **Low (1):** A score of 1 indicates projects that restore riverine processes (e.g., levee setbacks). The Plan generally favors process-based restoration techniques because there is greater certainty that the project will provide habitat benefits over the long term. Thus, it is a lower priority to study the benefit of this type of project.	**17.5**

	(↑ Return to Summary Table)	
Commonness of project type being studied	**How common is the project type being studied? How many of this type are we likely to do in the next 10 to 20 years?** • **High (5):** A score of 5 indicates that many of this project type are planned. Before we make future investments in a particular type of project, we should make sure they function as expected. Thus, it is more important to allocate monitoring dollars to studying this type of project. • **Medium (3):** A score of 3 indicates that some of this project type are planned. • **Low (1):** A score of 1 indicates we are not planning many of the project type in this subwatershed, while a score of 5 indicates that many are planned. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	**17.5**
Cost of project type being studied	**How expensive is the project type being studied?** • **High (5):** Relatively expensive projects score 5. If a project type will require the investment of large financial resources, effectiveness should be verified before many of these project types are undertaken. Thus, it is more important to allocate monitoring dollars to studying expensive project types. • **Medium (3):** Project has a relatively mid-range cost. • **Low (1):** Projects with relatively low costs receive a score of 1. If a project is cheap, it is less important to verify its effectiveness before many of these project types are undertaken. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	**17.5**
B. **Cumulative Effectiveness, Validation Monitoring, and Research Gap** Proposals		
Study Design and Methods	**Are sampling methods and study design scientifically sound?** • **High (5 points):** Uses proven scientific methods for sampling. Study design is thorough and well thought-out, including a plan for how the results will be statistically evaluated and	**15**

	what kind of inference will be possible with the results. • **Medium (3 points):** Uses methods that may have been tested but with incomplete or varying results. Study design is lacking in some regards. • **Low (1 point):** Uses sampling methods that have not been tested or proven to be effective in past uses. Study design is not thorough or well thought-out; does not think ahead to how results will be analyzed and what kind of inference will be possible with given study design. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	
Proposal Clarity	**Does the proposal clearly articulate a hypothesis and include clear goals and objectives?** Proposals should clearly articulate goals and objectives (see this document for example of difference between a goal and objective). Objectives should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound (SMART). Proposals should also include one or more specific hypotheses. • **High** (5 points): Proposal is clearly defined, identifies measurable goals and objectives. Hypotheses are clearly defined. • **Medium** (3 points): Proposal may not be completely clear, may lack one of the following: measurable goals, SMART objectives, or a clear hypothesis. • **Low** (1 point): Proposal is unclear and lacks one or more of the above requirements. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	**15**
Relevance to Salmon Recovery in WRIA 7	**Does the proposal fill a critical data gap or address an emerging issue that will help improve salmon recovery outcomes?** • **High (5):** Proposal clearly identifies a critical data gap, specifically citing a priority question from Plan's Chapter 12 or Appendix O, or one of many reports published since then; if proposal is focused on an emerging issue that doesn't appear in a previous plan or report, proposal makes an explicit link between research topic and goals of the Salmon Plan. Proposal explains how proposed research addresses uncertainties and clearly links research outcomes/hypotheses to improving salmon recovery outcomes.	**70**

	• **Medium (3):** Proposal only somewhat identifies critical data gap, may not specifically cite a previous plan or report, and may only somewhat explain how proposed research addresses uncertainties; link between research and salmon recovery outcomes less than clear. • **Low (1 point):** Proposal doesn't clearly identify critical data gap, doesn't cite Plan's Chapter 12, Appendix O, or previous reports, and doesn't link research outcomes/hypotheses to improving salmon recovery outcomes. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	

CERTAINTY OF SUCCESS Maximum points: 100 (no minimum requirement)		
Criteria	**Description**	**Max Pts**
Monitoring Study / Assessment Cost	**Are the costs reasonable for the type of work proposed?** • **High** (5 points): Cost for the proposal is low relative to the predicted benefits from knowledge we will gain from this monitoring proposal. Costs seem reasonable for the project. Watershed benefits for the cost are specific. • **Medium** (3 points): Cost is moderate relative to the predicted benefits. • **Low** (1 point): Cost is high relative to the predicted benefits or some items in the budget are questionable for the type of work. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	**20**
Community Involvement and Public Outreach	**Is the project involving and/or engaging the community?** Effectively reaching out to and involving the local community and other stakeholders in project development, design, and implementation is important to the success of the project. This is especially true for projects with significant risks or constraints. Appropriate outreach and involvement will vary by project type, size, location, and identified risks/constraints, and the Forum encourages project teams to consider the community engagement continuum provided below in	**20**

	Table 2. • **High** (5 points): Project or activity demonstrates direct engagement with the local community and relevant stakeholders and is aligned with the "community directs" or "collaborate" approaches in the community engagement continuum. • **Medium** (3 points): engagement reflects the "involve" approach in the continuum. • **Low** (1 point): engagement is best captured by the "inform" or "consult" approaches. ***0 points:*** no community or stakeholder outreach or involvement. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	

Sequence	**Is the project in the correct sequence and independent of other actions being taken first?**
	• **High** (5 points): Examples:
	  ○ Project is in the correct sequence and is independent of other actions being taken first.
	  ○ Builds on previous work.
	  ○ The proposed phase is a necessary step to future restoration or acquisition project implementation and there are no known risks to future implementation.
	• **Medium** (3 points): Examples:
	  ○ Project includes some actions that are out of sequence.
	  ○ Somewhat builds on previous work.
	  ○ Proposed phase may be necessary for future implementation and the proposal describes potential barriers to implementation and articulates how feasibility will be maximized during the proposed phase.
	• **Low** (1 point): Examples:
	  ○ Project is not in the correct sequence and requires other actions to be taken first.
	  ○ Does not consider or build on previous work.
	  ○ The proposal does not directly connect with future project implementation or has potential for significant risks that are not adequately addressed.
		20

	(↑ Return to Summary Table)	
Feasibility and Readiness	**Is the project feasible and ready to be implemented?** Proposals that are feasible and demonstrate a higher degree of readiness for implementation are a higher priority for receiving grant funds. A component of readiness is identifying and demonstrating how risks or constraints to implementation will be managed. • **High** (5 points): Project can be implemented in the next fish window following the grant award, demonstrates low risk or a strong risk management plan (such as through design elements or contingencies). Sponsor is qualified to do the work. • **Medium** (3 points): Project can be completed within two years of grant award and has higher, yet manageable, risk. • **Low** (1 point): Project is more than two years from implementation or has significant implementation risks. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	**20**
Equity and Social Justice	**Does the project reflect diversity, equity, and inclusion in the project design or implementation?** While habitat limiting factors drive the design and implementation of salmon recovery activities, restoration also offers opportunities to advance equity and social justice. *See the table on the final page of this document for definitions of diversity, equity, and inclusion*. The Forum considers this an important component of working in this watershed and encourages project sponsors to make every effort to ensure equitable outcomes during project design and implementation. • **High** (5 points): Project or activity demonstrates a strong understanding of diversity, equity, and inclusion, reflects these values in project design or implementation, and outlines ways to promote equity in the distribution of any potential benefits and risks in project design or implementation, particularly for underrepresented groups. Proposal demonstrates alignment with King County Equity and Social Justice pro-equity agenda, with attention to underserved and underrepresented communities. • **Medium** (3 points): Project diversity, equity, and inclusion in project design or implementation but does not take full advantage of opportunities to advance these values.	**5**

	• **Low** (1 point): Little or no acknowledgement of the need to promote equitable outcomes. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	
Policy Impact	**Does the proposal detail how policy might be impacted?** Strong projects specifically identify how different study outcomes might directly affect capital program policies and decisions that affect future efforts, such as by affecting decision making that is relevant to salmon recovery (e.g. specific policy, funding program, regulation, etc.). • **High** (5 points): proposal details how the monitoring project may affect capital program policies and/or identifies a specific decision point in the project selection and/or design cycle that may be affected. • **Medium** (3 points): proposal partially addresses how the monitoring project may affect capital program policies and/or how a specific decision point in the project selection and/or design cycle may be affected. • **Low** (1 point): proposal is unlikely to affect decision-making that is relevant to salmon recovery or fails to address this criterion. *(↑ Return to Summary Table)*	**15**

Questions?
Please contact Cory Zyla, Forum Project Coordinator at czyla@kingcounty.gov or 206-263-8453.

	Levels of Engagement →				
	INFORM	**CONSULT**	**INVOLVE**	**COLLABORATE**	**COMMUNITY DIRECTS**
Community Participation Goal	To provide the community with balanced, factual and culturally appropriate information to assist them in understanding the problems, alternatives and/or solutions.	To obtain community feedback on analysis, alternatives and/or decision.	To work directly with communities throughout the process to ensure that community issues and concerns are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with communities in each aspect of the decision, including the initial development of alternatives and the preferred solution.	To place final decision- making in the hands of the public or community.
Message to the Community	We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge concerns and provide feedback on how community input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and issues are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how community input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions. We will incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.
Characteristics of Engagement	• Primarily one-way channel of communication • Term-limited to project • Addresses immediate need of project and community	• Primarily one-way channel of communication • One to multiple interactions • Shapes and informs project	• Two-way channel of communication • Multiple interactions • Advancement of solutions to complex problems		
Strategies	Media releases, brochures, pamphlets, outreach to vulnerable populations, ethnic media contacts, translated information, staff outreach to residents, new and social media	Focus groups, interviews, community surveys	Forums, advisory boards, stakeholder involvement, coalitions, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony, workshops, community-wide events	Co-led community meetings, advisory boards, coalitions, and partnerships, policy development and advocacy, including legislative briefings and testimony	Community-led planning efforts, community-hosted forums, collaborative partnerships, coalitions, policy development and advocacy including legislative briefings and testimony
Timeframe Examples	Usually fast, often time- sensitive. For example, 1 day to 1 week.	Often episodic, usually tied to one-time projects, decisions or grants. Often 1 week to 1 month, e.g. 30 day public comment periods.	Variable, often several months. Moving toward on-going relationships rather than episodic,	Often several months, to on- going.	Variable, often weeks, months or on-going.

Table 1. Community Engagement Continuum

Diversity, Equity, Inclusion (DEI) Definitions

Diversity: Demographic representation and appreciation of individual, social, economic, and cultural differences that may include race, ethnicity, gender expression, sexual orientation, national origin, socio-economic status, age, educational background, abilities, and religious beliefs.

Equity: A state, quality, or ideal of being fair and just. The principle of equity acknowledges groups that have systematically and historically been excluded or marginalized and fairness regarding these conditions is needed to balance opportunities for all groups.

Inclusion: A state, quality, or ideal of being a part of a group or structure where the inherent worth and dignity of all people are recognized and respected. More than diversity and numerical representation, inclusion involves authentic and empowered participation and a sense of belonging and of feeling valued.