WRIA 8 Grant Review Criteria

Introduction and background

WRIA 8 plays a central role in the grant funding process for the King County Flood Control District's Cooperative Watershed Management grant program and the state-administered Salmon Recovery Funding Board and Puget Sound Acquisition and Restoration programs. Grant proposals for these programs are solicited by WRIA 8, the WRIA 8 Project Subcommittee (Subcommittee) reviews proposals and recommends projects for funding to the WRIA 8 Salmon Recovery Council, and the Council's decisions are in turn submitted to the funding agencies for final approval.

The Subcommittee's review is intended to identify the alignment of grant proposals with the objectives of the *Lake Washington/Cedar/Sammamish Watershed (WRIA 8) Chinook Salmon Recovery Plan* (WRIA 8 Plan). The grant review criteria are the primary tool used to support the Subcommittee's evaluation, providing a framework for documenting how each grant proposal supports the Chinook salmon recovery priorities articulated in the WRIA 8 Plan. By quantifying the relative benefit to Chinook and certainty of success, the Subcommittee can compare proposals and have a basis for developing funding recommendations. The criteria also provide a mechanism for project sponsors to evaluate the competitiveness of potential grant submittals.

This document is a living document and is intended to be refined over time. Additionally, these criteria are one tool used by the Subcommittee in developing recommendations for funding, but there may be other factors not represented here that determine whether a particular proposal is recommended to receive grant funds.

WRIA 8 Plan Assumptions

The "Benefits to Chinook" component of the criteria is based on several assumptions from the 2017 WRIA 8 Plan Update:

- The Cedar River Chinook population is at greatest risk of extinction and is WRIA 8's highest priority.
- All areas within the WRIA 8 watershed play a role in Chinook salmon recovery. The highest quality remaining habitat and greatest Chinook use is generally found in Tier 1 areas as described by the WRIA 8 Plan. Tier 2 areas are less frequently used for Chinook spawning but are important for spatial diversity of Chinook in the watershed. Tier 3 areas are those that generally see little Chinook use but contribute to overall water quality in the watershed. For evaluating salmon recovery projects, actions in Tier 1 areas are considered higher priority than Tier 2 areas, and Tier 2 areas are higher priority than Tier 3.
- The life history stage which data show to be most habitat-limited in WRIA 8 is the juvenile stage, i.e., from emergence through migration to salt water. Juvenile salmon are susceptible to winter flooding

and have relatively few places of refuge during floods. Therefore, the highest priority projects are those that increase the amount and complexity of off-channel habitat and flood refugia.

- Restoration of ecological *processes* will facilitate a project that can sustain over time and is the preferred approach to restoration.
    - Priority is given to projects that clearly demonstrate a focus on restoring habitat forming processes rather than those that are intended to function more statically.
    - Proposals should demonstrate an understanding of the ecological conditions that are most limiting to salmon at a particular location and should offer solutions intended to improve those conditions.
    - Watershed processes tend to operate at a large spatial scale, and priority is given to larger projects.

Applying the WRIA 8 Grant Review Criteria

- Site-specific habitat protection and restoration projects and project phases associated with these projects will be evaluated using the "Restoration/Protection Project Scoring Criteria." Projects where the primary focus is riparian habitat restoration will be evaluated using the "Riparian Habitat/Stewardship Project Scoring Criteria."

Raising our Awareness of Diversity, Equity, Inclusion and Environmental Justice

The WRIA 8 watershed offers many opportunities to better integrate diversity, equity, inclusion, and environmental justice into salmon recovery implementation. In 2020, WRIA 8 developed a diversity, equity, and inclusion plan. A near-term objective is to encourage grant applicants to identify opportunities to advance objectives of equity and environmental justice through the implementation of their projects and programs. This is an evolving effort that has been modified over time, and the 2023 grant application materials ask applicants to describe how their proposed projects and activities promote community engagement and equitable outcomes. Criteria for each of the main categories of eligible activities reflect this emphasis.

WRIA 8 SRFB/PSAR Restoration/Protection Project Scoring Criteria

Benefits to Chinook

1) Cedar Population

The Cedar population is WRIA 8's highest priority and at greater risk of extinction. Projects in the Cedar River sub-basin or that benefit freshwater habitat used by the Cedar population are prioritized.

- Scoring (all proposals)
  - 10: Restoration or acquisition project located in the Cedar River sub-basin or located in other freshwater habitats used by the Cedar population (south Lake Washington, Lake Union, and the Ship Canal)
  - 0: Project located in an area that does not benefit the Cedar population

2) WRIA 8 Tier

All areas within WRIA 8 play a role in Chinook salmon recovery. The highest quality remaining habitat and the most Chinook use are generally found in Tier 1 areas. Tier 2 areas are less frequently used for Chinook spawning but are important for spatial diversity of Chinook in the watershed. Tier 3 areas are those that typically see little Chinook use but contribute to watershed function and provide habitat for other salmonids. For evaluating Chinook salmon recovery projects, Tier 1 areas are considered higher priority than Tier 2 areas, and Tier 2 areas are higher priority than Tier 3.

- Scoring (all proposals)
  - Tier 1: 10
  - Tier 2: 5
  - Tier 3: 1

3) Benefit to Habitat Features for Juvenile Chinook

The life history stage which data show to be most habitat-limited in WRIA 8 is the juvenile stage, i.e., from emergence through migration to salt water. Juvenile salmon are susceptible to winter flooding and have relatively few places of refuge during floods. They are also subject to predation by native and non-native predators. The highest priority projects are those that increase the amount and complexity of off-channel habitat, low velocity edge habitat, and flood refugia for juveniles. Actions to decrease predation pressure are also high priority.

- Scoring (all proposals)
  - 7 – 10: Project will enhance or protect existing juvenile Chinook salmon rearing habitat, create habitat that is intended to support juvenile rearing, or otherwise provide lift to a habitat type that is limiting to juvenile Chinook salmon (including acquisition or design intended to support these actions)

- 4 – 6: Project will provide marginal benefits to juvenile Chinook rearing habitat or juvenile habitat is a secondary project element
- 0 – 3: Project does not target the juvenile life stage, or the project does not demonstrate a connection to juvenile habitat

4) Addresses Primary Ecological Concerns or Limiting Factors

The factors limiting Chinook salmon productivity and survival in WRIA 8 are numerous, with some of the most significant factors being:

- loss of floodplain connectivity
- degraded riparian vegetation
- disrupted sediment processes
- shoreline armoring
- loss of channel and shoreline complexity
- elevated water temperatures

Proposed actions should address the *primary* ecological concern(s) at the site and align with WRIA 8 recovery strategies. Project sponsors should be able to demonstrate an understanding of site-specific limiting factors and describe how the proposed action will address the limiting factor or factors. Refer to Appendix E (Recovery Strategies) of the *2017 WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan Update* for guidance. Sponsors may also draw on other data sources as appropriate to characterize the problem and the way in which the proposed action will address the problem.

The 2017 *WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conservation Plan Update* outlines goals for a series of habitat components that relate to critical habitat bottlenecks in WRIA 8 (Appendix D: Habitat Goals). Proposals describing an ability to make progress toward the goals will be recognized in the scoring.

- Restoration Implementation Project Scoring
  - 10: Proposal addresses those factors known to be most limiting to salmon survival and productivity at the project scale
  - 5 – 9: Proposal partially addresses ecological concerns
  - 0 – 4: Proposal insufficient to address ecological concerns
- Acquisition Project Scoring
  - 10: Proposal will protect high quality habitat and preserve existing ecological function
  - 5 – 9: Proposal will protect some high-quality habitat or an area planned for restoration actions that will result in high quality habitat
  - 0 – 4: Proposal will not protect important habitat, or the benefits of future restoration activity is unknown or likely insufficient to address the primary concerns
- Project Planning and Design Scoring
  - 10: Proposal has direct linkage to a project intended to address primary ecological concerns or limiting factors at the project scale (should be clearly described in proposal)
  - 5 – 9: Proposal suggests ecological concerns will be partially addressed

- 0 – 4: Proposal demonstrates little understanding of key ecological concerns at the project scale or does not offer confidence that concerns will be remedied

5) Supports Ecosystem Processes

While sites in WRIA 8 often can be constrained by adjacent land uses, the WRIA 8 Plan calls for actions that promote natural ecosystem processes. As much as possible, projects should strive for dynamic project elements that target the root causes of habitat degradation, are tailored to the physical and biological potential at the site and are expected to adjust over time with minimal maintenance. Connectivity to other protected or restored areas within a reach also supports ecosystem process and should be demonstrated where possible.

- Restoration Implementation Project Scoring
  - 10: Project includes process-based features/techniques and intends to provide long-term, naturally sustainable, and resilient habitat benefits; has meaningful connectivity
  - 5 – 9: Project incorporates process-based features where allowed by the site and to the extent practical but site constraints dictate that some structural elements may be necessary (structural elements include bioengineered streambank stabilization or non-deformable log structures); has some connectivity to other protected/restored areas
  - 0 – 4: Project does not take advantage of the opportunities the site offers for process-based features or doesn't express creativity to incorporate process-based elements
- Acquisition Project Scoring
  - 10: Protects parcel(s) with important watershed processes (e.g., connected floodplain, side channels, mature riparian forest); directly adjacent to other protected areas
  - 5 – 9: Protects parcel(s) with a moderate degree of functional processes or can be restored to enable natural process; has some connectivity to other protected areas
  - 0 – 4: Target acquisition has very limited functionality or is not likely to be restored
- Project Planning and Design Scoring
  - 10: Proposal is necessary to understand watershed processes, is directly linked to project development for a process-based action, or will clearly lead to a project incorporating natural processes
  - 5 – 9: Proposal does not provide enough information to fully evaluate the extent to which future actions resulting from this work will support watershed processes, or process-based features/techniques are somewhat limited
  - 0 – 4: Proposal does not appear to support watershed processes

6) Scale of Project Proposed for Funding

Larger projects have greater potential to preserve or restore reach or landscape-scale processes. What may be considered large in the Cedar sub-basin is different than what may be considered large in other Tier 1 and Tier 2 stream systems. To encourage larger projects, more points are awarded to projects affecting greater amounts of riparian or floodplain habitat.

- Scoring (all proposals)

- 10:
  - Cedar River – 20 acres of riparian/floodplain habitat or greater OR linear feet greater than 50x average bankfull width
  - Other streams – 10 acres of riparian/floodplain habitat or greater OR linear feet greater than 50x average bankfull width
  - Lake or marine shoreline – 150 linear feet or greater
- 5:
  - Cedar River – 15 – 19 acres OR linear feet between 20-50x average bankfull width
  - Other streams – 5 – 9 acres OR linear feet between 20-50x average bankfull width
  - Lake or marine shoreline – 75 – 149 feet
- 1:
  - Cedar River – fewer than 15 acres OR linear feet less than 20x average bankfull width
  - Other streams – fewer than 5 acres OR linear feet less than 20x average bankfull width
  - Lake or marine shoreline – less than 75 feet

NOTE: For fish passage barrier removal projects, score 10 points for removing a complete passage barrier, and score 5 points for removing a partial passage barrier.

Certainty of Success

1) Approach

Proposals should clearly articulate an approach and scope grounded in a conceptual hypothesis of the way in which the proposed action will benefit fish habitat, with clear goals and objectives. Objectives should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. Sponsors should refer to the WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conceptual Model.

- Restoration Implementation Project Scoring
  - 8 – 10: Proposal clearly describes the approach, the methods are accepted practice for dealing with the identified problem(s), and goals and objectives are clear
  - 4 – 7: Proposal lacks clarity in certain elements, or the chosen methods are questionable
  - 0 – 3: Proposal is unclear, goals and objectives are poorly defined, or methods are unproven or otherwise do not appear adequate

- Acquisition Project Scoring
  - 8 – 10: Proposal clearly describes why acquisition is necessary and the preferred action
  - 4 – 7: Proposal not entirely clear on what the acquisition will achieve, or goals and objectives are not well-defined
  - 0 – 3: Unclear why acquisition is needed or goals and objectives are lacking

- Project Planning and Design Scoring
  - 8 – 10: Proposal clearly describes the goals and objectives of this phase and sets in the context of watershed recovery and describes how the work being proposed will directly support project development or will produce conceptual, preliminary, or final designs

- 4 – 7: Goals and objectives not well-defined or conceptual hypothesis is questionable
- 0 – 3: Goals and objectives are poorly constructed, and the proposal lacks a conceptual hypothesis of how salmon recovery will be advanced through the proposed work

2) Feasibility, Readiness, and Sequence

Proposals that are feasible and demonstrate a higher degree of readiness for implementation are a higher priority for receiving grant funds, as are proposals in the proper sequence relative to other actions in the basin. A component of readiness is identifying and demonstrating how risks or constraints to implementation will be managed.

- Restoration Implementation Project Scoring
  - 8 – 10: 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), and the sequence is appropriate
  - 4 – 7: Project can be completed within two years of grant award and has higher, yet manageable, risk
  - 0 – 3: Project is more than two years from implementation or has significant implementation risks and is out of sequence
- Acquisition Project Scoring
  - 8 – 10: Landowner willingness is documented in the proposal
  - 4 – 7: Specific parcels identified; landowners aware and supportive of the proposal
  - 0 – 3: Landowner contact has not yet been initiated or parcels aren't identified
- Project Planning and Design Scoring
  - 8 – 10: The proposed phase is a necessary step to future restoration or acquisition project implementation and there are no known risks to future implementation
  - 4 – 7: 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
  - 0 – 3: The proposal does not directly connect with future project implementation or has potential for significant risks that are not adequately addressed

3) Cost-Effectiveness

A project's cost effectiveness is based on the cost of the project relative to its anticipated benefits to Chinook. The benefits should justify the cost and be reasonable based on the work proposed.

- Scoring (all proposals)
  - 8 – 10: Cost for the proposal is low relative to the expected Chinook habitat benefit; individual budget items are in line with expectations for the type of work proposed
  - 4 – 7: Cost is moderate relative to the expected Chinook habitat benefit
  - 0 – 3: Cost is high relative to the expected Chinook habitat benefit or some items in the budget are questionable for the type of work

4) Climate Change

Changing climate and effects associated with these changes have the potential to exacerbate existing stressors on Chinook salmon, as well as create new, unforeseen problems. Recovery actions designed to accommodate changing future conditions and allow natural processes are more likely to be capable of providing resilient habitat benefits regardless of the changes that may occur.

- Scoring (all proposals)
  - 5: Proposal identifies how climate change has the potential to affect future conditions at the site and describes how the proposed action will be resilient under changing future conditions
  - 2 – 4: Proposal may be resilient to changing future conditions
  - 0 – 1: No discussion of climate change or very limited potential for resilience

5) Project Evaluation

While funding for monitoring and post-project evaluation is limited, WRIA 8 encourages sponsors to explore opportunities to evaluate the success of their actions. Reference the WRIA 8 Monitoring and Assessment Plan for guidance.

- Scoring (only awarded to restoration projects)
  - 5: Proposal includes project effectiveness monitoring to assess outcomes that are linked to the project's objectives over an appropriate time frame; the strategy and metrics are well-defined and address the site's limiting factors and other attributes, as applicable, such as fish utilization, light reduction, temperature reduction, and water quality improvement
  - 2 – 4: Proposal intends to measure outcomes for a limited time frame as part of a monitoring and adaptive management plan; measurement does not target the effectiveness of the project in addressing limiting factors but focuses more on whether the project is functioning as designed
  - 0 – 1: Measurement is limited to outputs (assessing what was implemented) or the proposal does not define a measurement strategy or metrics

6) Equity and Environmental Justice

While habitat limiting factors drive the design and implementation of salmon recovery activities, restoration also offers opportunities to advance equity and environmental justice. WRIA 8 considers this an important component of working in this watershed and encourages project sponsors to ensure equitable outcomes during project design and implementation. See page 20 for definitions of diversity, equity, inclusion, and environmental justice.

- Scoring
  - 10: Project or activity demonstrates a strong understanding of equity and environmental justice, clearly and appropriately reflects these values and outcomes in project design or implementation, and outlines ways to promote equity and environmental justice in the distribution of any potential benefits and risks in project design or implementation. *(for example, a project may be in a King County Land Conservation Initiative opportunity*

area or area identified on the Washington State Environmental Health Disparities Map as having high environmental health disparities; project may involve hiring women and minority-owned businesses or measurably contribute to increased economic benefit for priority populations, including low income, people of color, and those with limited English proficiency; project may support or provide opportunities for cultural practices and/or include outreach and interpretive information for non-English audiences)

- 5 – 9: Project acknowledges and incorporates some level of equity and environmental justice in project design or implementation but does not take full advantage of opportunities to advance these values and outcomes. *(<u>for example</u>, a project may or may not be in a King County Land Conservation Initiative opportunity area and/or an area identified on the Washington State Environmental Health Disparities Map as having medium environmental health disparities; takes advantage of some, but not all opportunities to hire women and minority-owned businesses or measurably contribute to increased economic benefit for priority populations; project makes some effort to support or provide opportunities for cultural practices and/or include outreach and interpretive information for non-English audiences)*
- 0 – 4: Little or no acknowledgement of the need to promote equitable outcomes. *(<u>for example</u>, a project is not in a King County Land Conservation Initiative opportunity area and/or is in an area identified on the Washington State Environmental Health Disparities Map as having low environmental health disparities; a project does not involve hiring women or minority-owned businesses and does not measurably contribute to increased economic benefit for priority populations; project does not support or provide opportunities for cultural practices and/or include outreach and interpretive information for non-English audiences)*

7) Community Engagement and Public Outreach

Effectively reaching out to and involving the local community and other partners in project development, design, and implementation is important to the success of a project. This is especially true for projects with significant risks or constraints. Appropriate outreach and engagement will vary by project type, size, location, and identified risks/constraints. WRIA 8 encourages project teams to consider the community engagement continuum on page 20 of this document.

- <u>Scoring</u>
  - 10: Project or activity demonstrates direct engagement with the local community and relevant partners (including private property owners) and is aligned with and takes full advantage of the most appropriate level of community engagement approaches in the community engagement continuum to ensure long-term stewardship.
  - 5 – 9: Community and stakeholder engagement reflects a generally appropriate approach in the continuum but does not take full advantage of community engagement opportunities.
  - 1 – 4: Community and stakeholder engagement reflects a limited approach based on the continuum and does not take advantage of appropriate and available opportunities.
  - 0: No community or stakeholder outreach or involvement.

WRIA 8 SRFB Riparian Habitat/Stewardship Project Scoring Criteria

Benefits to Chinook

1) Cedar Population

The Cedar population is WRIA 8's highest priority and at greater risk of extinction. Projects in the Cedar River sub-basin or that benefit freshwater habitat used by the Cedar population are prioritized.

- Scoring
  - 10: Restoration or acquisition project located in the Cedar River sub-basin or located in other freshwater habitats used by the Cedar population (south Lake Washington, Lake Union, and the Ship Canal)
  - 0: Project located in an area that does not benefit the Cedar population

2) WRIA 8 Tier

All areas within the WRIA 8 watershed play a role in Chinook salmon recovery. The highest quality remaining habitat and greatest Chinook use is generally found in Tier 1 areas. Tier 2 areas are less frequently used for Chinook spawning but are important for spatial diversity of Chinook in the watershed. Tier 3 areas are those that typically see little Chinook use but contribute to overall water quality in the watershed and provide habitat for other salmonids. For evaluating Chinook salmon recovery projects, Tier 1 areas are considered higher priority than Tier 2 areas, and Tier 2 areas are higher priority than Tier 3.

- Scoring
  - Tier 1: 10
  - Tier 2: 5
  - Tier 3: 1

3) Benefit to Juvenile Chinook

The life history stage which data show to be most habitat-limited in WRIA 8 is the juvenile stage, i.e., from emergence through migration to salt water. The highest priority riparian habitat projects are in locations that offer the greatest potential to improve conditions for juvenile Chinook, which includes areas lacking existing riparian cover or which are dominated by invasive plant species, key migratory corridors, and tributary mouths.

- Scoring
  - 10: Project will enhance riparian habitat in one of the following: highly degraded reaches in Tier 1 or Tier 2 stream systems, Segments 1 and 2 of the Lake Washington

shoreline, nearshore between West Point and Golden Gardens, or encompassing a stream mouth junction with another waterbody
    - 5: Project will enhance riparian habitat in one of the following: areas with some existing, functional riparian habitat; Segments 5 and 7 of the Lake Washington shoreline; Lake Sammamish shoreline; or the nearshore between Golden Gardens and Boeing Creek
    - 1: Project will enhance riparian habitat in one of the following: areas with existing, functional riparian habitat (i.e., additional restoration not necessary); Segments 3, 4, and 6 of the Lake Washington shoreline; or the nearshore north of Boeing Creek

4) Scale of Project Proposed for Funding

Larger projects have greater potential to preserve or restore reach or landscape-scale processes. What may be considered large in the Cedar sub-basin is different than what may be considered large in other Tier 1 and Tier 2 stream systems. To encourage larger projects, more points are awarded to projects affecting greater amounts of riparian or floodplain habitat.

- <u>Scoring</u>
    - 10:
        - Cedar River – 20 acres of riparian/floodplain habitat or greater OR linear feet greater than 50x average bankfull width
        - Other streams – 10 acres of riparian/floodplain habitat or greater OR linear feet greater than 50x average bankfull width
        - Lake or marine shoreline – 150 linear feet or greater
    - 5:
        - Cedar River – 15 – 19 acres OR linear feet between 20-50x average bankfull width
        - Other streams – 5 – 9 acres OR linear feet between 20-50x average bankfull width
        - Lake or marine shoreline – 75 – 149 feet
    - 1:
        - Cedar River – fewer than 15 acres OR linear feet less than 20x average bankfull width
        - Other streams – fewer than 5 acres OR linear feet less than 20x average bankfull width
        - Lake or marine shoreline – less than 75 feet

5) Revegetation/Replanting

Treatment of invasive species, while important, is not alone enough to ensure a successful riparian restoration project. Proposals that contain a substantial revegetation component that emphasizes planting of native coniferous species will receive higher scores under this criterion.

- <u>Scoring</u>
    - 10: Project identifies revegetation with native species as a clear objective; project emphasizes planting of coniferous trees
    - 5: Project identifies revegetation with native species as a clear objective; emphasis on planting of coniferous trees is less than desired for the given location

- 1: Project targets noxious weed treatment only and does not include a planting element

Certainty of Success

1) Approach

Proposals should clearly articulate an approach and scope grounded in a conceptual hypothesis of the way in which the proposed action will benefit fish habitat, with clear goals and objectives. Objectives should be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound. Sponsors should refer to the WRIA 8 Chinook Salmon Conceptual Model.

- Scoring
  - 8 – 10: Proposal clearly describes the approach, the methods are accepted practice for dealing with the identified problem(s), and goals and objectives are clear
  - 4 – 7: Proposal lacks clarity in certain elements or the chosen methods are questionable
  - 0 – 3: Proposal is unclear, goals and objectives are poorly defined, or methods are unproven or otherwise do not appear adequate

2) Feasibility, Readiness, and Sequence

Proposals that are feasible and demonstrate a higher degree of readiness for implementation are a higher priority for receiving grant funds, as are proposals in the proper sequence relative to other actions in the basin. A component of readiness is identifying and demonstrating how risks or constraints to implementation will be managed.

- Scoring
  - 9 – 10: Project has the necessary permissions (permits/landowner willingness) secured or will be able to secure such permissions so that work can proceed within one year of grant award, and the sequence is appropriate
  - 4 – 8: Project does not have the necessary permissions secured but expect to within two years of a grant award and has higher, yet manageable, risk
  - 0 – 3: Project is not expected to move forward for a period greater than two years from the time of a grant award, has significant implementation risks, or is out of sequence

3) Cost-Effectiveness

A project's cost effectiveness is based on the cost of the project relative to its anticipated benefits to Chinook. The benefits should justify the cost and be reasonable based on the work proposed.

- Scoring
  - 8 – 10: Cost for the proposal is low relative to the expected Chinook habitat benefit; individual budget items are in line with expectations for the type of work proposed
  - 4 – 7: Cost is moderate relative to the expected Chinook habitat benefit
  - 0 – 3: Cost is high relative to the expected Chinook habitat benefit or some items in the budget are questionable for the type of work

4) Project Evaluation

While funding for monitoring and post-project evaluation is limited, WRIA 8 encourages sponsors to explore opportunities to evaluate the success of their actions. Reference the WRIA 8 Monitoring and Assessment Plan for guidance.

- Scoring
  - 5: Proposal includes project effectiveness monitoring to assess outcomes that are linked to the project's objectives over an appropriate time frame; the strategy and metrics are well-defined and address the site's limiting factors and other attributes, as applicable, such as fish utilization, light reduction, temperature reduction, and water quality improvement
  - 2 – 4: Proposal intends to measure outcomes for a limited time frame as part of a monitoring and adaptive management plan; measurement does not target the effectiveness of the project in addressing limiting factors but focuses more on whether the project is functioning as designed
  - 0 – 1: Measurement is limited to outputs (assessing what was implemented) or the proposal does not define a measurement strategy or metrics
  -

5) Equity and Environmental Justice

While habitat limiting factors drive the design and implementation of salmon recovery activities, restoration also offers opportunities to advance equity and environmental justice. WRIA 8 considers this an important component of working in this watershed and encourages project sponsors to ensure equitable outcomes during project design and implementation. See page 20 for definitions of diversity, equity, inclusion, and environmental justice.

- Scoring
  - 10: Project or activity demonstrates a strong understanding of equity and environmental justice, clearly and appropriately reflects these values and outcomes in project design or implementation, and outlines ways to promote equity and environmental justice in the distribution of any potential benefits and risks in project design or implementation. *(for example, a project may be in a King County Land Conservation Initiative opportunity area or area identified on the Washington State Environmental Health Disparities Map as having high environmental health disparities; project may involve hiring women and minority-owned businesses or measurably contribute to increased economic benefit for priority populations, including low income, people of color, and those with limited English proficiency; project may support or provide opportunities for cultural practices and/or include outreach and interpretive information for non-English audiences)*
  - 5 – 9: Project acknowledges and incorporates some level of equity and environmental justice in project design or implementation but does not take full advantage of opportunities to advance these values and outcomes. *(for example, a project may or may not be in a King County Land Conservation Initiative opportunity area and/or an area identified on the Washington State Environmental Health Disparities Map as having*

medium environmental health disparities; takes advantage of some, but not all opportunities to hire women and minority-owned businesses or measurably contribute to increased economic benefit for priority populations; project makes some effort to support or provide opportunities for cultural practices and/or include outreach and interpretive information for non-English audiences)

- 0 – 4: Little or no acknowledgement of the need to promote equitable outcomes. *(for example, a project is not in a King County Land Conservation Initiative opportunity area and/or is in an area identified on the Washington State Environmental Health Disparities Map as having low environmental health disparities; a project does not involve hiring women or minority-owned businesses and does not measurably contribute to increased economic benefit for priority populations; project does not support or provide opportunities for cultural practices and/or include outreach and interpretive information for non-English audiences.*

6) Community Engagement and Public Outreach

Effectively reaching out to and involving the local community and other partners in project development, design, and implementation is important to the success of a project. This is especially true for projects with significant risks or constraints. Appropriate outreach and engagement will vary by project type, size, location, and identified risks/constraints. WRIA 8 encourages project teams to consider the community engagement continuum on page 19 of this document.

- Scoring
  - 10: Project or activity demonstrates direct engagement with the local community and relevant partners (including private property owners) and is aligned with and takes full advantage of the most appropriate level of community engagement approaches in the community engagement continuum to ensure long-term stewardship.
  - 5 – 9: Community and stakeholder engagement reflects a generally appropriate approach in the continuum but does not take full advantage of community engagement opportunities.
  - 1 – 4: Community and stakeholder engagement reflects a limited approach based on the continuum and does not take advantage of appropriate and available opportunities.
    0: No community or stakeholder outreach or involvement.

Community Engagement Continuum

	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.

Diversity, Equity, Inclusion (DEI) and Environmental Justice 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.

Environmental Justice: The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. This includes using an intersectional lens to address disproportionate environmental and health impacts by prioritizing highly impacted populations, equitably distributing resources and benefits, and eliminating harm.

Restoration/Protection Project Scoring Criteria – Benefit to Chinook

Category	Evaluation Question	Scoring	Multiplier	Total Possible Points
Benefit to Cedar River Chinook Population	Will the project provide benefits to the Cedar River Chinook population (includes all freshwater habitat used by the Cedar population)?	Yes – 10 No – 0	1	10
WRIA 8 Tier	Is the project located in Tier 1, 2, or 3?	Tier 1 – 10 Tier 2 – 5 Tier 3 – 1	1	10
Benefit to Habitat Features for Juvenile Chinook	Does the project demonstrate that it will enhance, create, or otherwise provide lift to a habitat type that is limiting to juvenile Chinook salmon?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1.5	15
Addresses Primary Ecological Concerns or Limiting Factor(s)	Does the proposed project address the *primary* ecological concern(s) most relevant at the site? • Restoration projects – Maximum points awarded to proposals that address those factors known to be most limiting to salmon survival and productivity at the project scale. • Acquisition projects – Maximum points awarded to proposals that protect areas of intact, high quality habitat. Slight decrease in point value for areas being acquired that are planned for restoration that will result in high quality habitat. • Project planning and design – Maximum points awarded to proposals that will inform or lead to projects intended to address primary ecological concerns or limiting factors.	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	2	20
Supports Ecosystem Processes	Does the project promote natural ecosystem processes, contain dynamic project elements that will target the root cause(s) of habitat degradation, reflect the physical and biological potential at the site (and within the reach), and display an ability to adjust over time with minimal maintenance? • Restoration projects – Maximum points awarded to proposals that include process-based features and are intended to provide long-term, naturally sustainable, and resilient habitat benefits. • Acquisition projects – Maximum points awarded to proposals that protect watershed processes. Slight decrease in point value where property can be restored to support a future process-based restoration project. • Project planning and design – Maximum points awarded to proposals that are necessary to understand watershed processes or will clearly lead to a project that promotes natural processes.	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	3	30

Scale of the Project	What is the size of the proposed project? Cutoffs are as follows: • Large – Cedar: 20 acres or greater; other streams: 10 acres or greater; OR linear feet >50x avg bankfull width; Lake WA/Ship Canal and Nearshore: greater than 150 linear feet • Medium – Cedar: 15-19.9 acres; other streams: 5-9.9 acres; OR linear feet 20-50x avg bankfull width; Lake WA/Ship Canal and Nearshore: 75-150 linear feet • Small – Cedar: <15 acres; other streams: <5 acres; OR linear feet <20x bankfull width; Lake WA/Ship Canal and Nearshore: <75 feet	Large – 10 Medium – 5 Small – 1	1.5	15
	Total			**100**

Restoration/Protection Project Scoring Criteria – Certainty of Success

Criteria	Evaluation Question	Scoring	Multiplier	Total Possible Points
Approach	Does the proposal articulate an approach and scope grounded in a conceptual hypothesis of how the proposed action will benefit fish habitat? Are there clear goals and objectives? • Restoration projects – Maximum points for proposals that are clear in describing the approach, uses appropriate methods, and has clear goals and objectives. • Acquisition projects – Maximum points for proposals clearly describing why acquisition is necessary and is preferable to other actions. • Project planning and design – Maximum points for proposals clearly describing the problem and how the work being proposed will directly support project development or lead to design deliverables.	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	2	20
Feasibility, Readiness, and Sequence	Does the proposed action seem feasible, demonstrate readiness for implementation, and occur in the appropriate sequence? • Restoration projects – Maximum points for proposals that are logically sequenced with other activities, offers low risk, and can be implemented in the next fish window following grant award. • Acquisition projects – Maximum points for documented landowner willingness. • Project planning and design – Maximum points where the activity is a necessary first step for future project implementation and there are no major barriers to subsequent implementation, or where barriers will be explored during the proposed project phase.	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1.5	15
Cost Effectiveness	Is the overall cost low relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in the proposed location, and are individual budget items reasonable?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
Climate Change	Does the proposal identify how climate may influence future conditions affecting the site and propose an approach that will be resilient under changing future conditions?	High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0	1	5
Project Evaluation (only to be applied to restoration projects)	Does the proposal outline an approach for assessing outcomes linked to the project's objectives over an appropriate timeframe and with a well-defined strategy and metrics?	High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0	1	5

Equity and Environmental Justice	How will this project advance objectives of equity and environmental justice (see page 20 for definitions)?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1.5	15
Community Engagement and Public Outreach	Does the project engage in project-level partnerships and collaboration with watershed communities in project development, design, and implementation (see community engagement continuum on page 19)?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1.5	15
		Total		**85**

Riparian Habitat/Stewardship Project Scoring Criteria – Benefit to Chinook

Category	Evaluation Question	Scoring	Multiplier	Total Possible Points
Benefit to Cedar River Chinook Population	Will the project provide benefits to the Cedar River Chinook population (includes all freshwater habitat used by the Cedar population)?	Yes – 10 No – 0	1	10
WRIA 8 Tier	Is the project located in Tier 1, 2, or 3?	Tier 1 – 10 Tier 2 – 5 Tier 3 – 1	1	10
Benefit for Juvenile Chinook	Does the project demonstrate that it will enhance riparian habitat in locations that are thought to offer the greatest potential to benefit juvenile Chinook?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	2	20
Scale of the Project	What is the size of the proposed project? Cutoffs are as follows: • Large – Cedar: 20 acres or greater; other streams: 10 acres or greater; OR linear feet >50x avg bankfull width; Lake WA/Ship Canal and Nearshore: greater than 150 linear feet • Medium – Cedar: 15-19.9 acres; other streams: 5-9.9 acres; OR linear feet 20-50x avg bankfull width; Lake WA/Ship Canal and Nearshore: 75-150 linear feet • Small – Cedar: <15 acres; other streams: <5 acres; OR linear feet <20x bankfull width; Lake WA/Ship Canal and Nearshore: <75 feet	Large – 10 Medium – 5 Small – 1	1.5	15
Revegetation / Replanting	Does the project identify revegetation with native species as a clear objective, including the planting of conifers?	High – 10 Medium – 4 Low – 1	2	20
	Total			**75**

Riparian Habitat/Stewardship Project Scoring Criteria – Certainty of Success

Criteria	Evaluation Question	Scoring	Multiplier	Total Possible Points
Approach	Does the proposal articulate an approach and scope grounded in a conceptual hypothesis of how the proposed action will benefit fish habitat? Are there clear goals and objectives? • Maximum points for proposals that are clear in describing the approach, use appropriate methods, and have clear goals and objectives.	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
Feasibility, Readiness, and Sequence	Is the proposed action feasible, demonstrate readiness for implementation, and occur in the appropriate sequence? • Maximum points for proposals that have necessary permissions secured or will be able to advance with the work within one year of award and are in appropriate sequence with other activities.	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1.5	15
Cost Effectiveness	Is the overall cost low relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in the proposed location, and are individual budget items reasonable?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
Project Evaluation (only to be applied to restoration projects)	Does the proposal outline an approach for assessing outcomes linked to the project's objectives over an appropriate timeframe and with a well-defined strategy and metrics?	High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0	1	5
Equity and Environmental Justice	How will this project advance objectives of equity and environmental justice (see page 20 for definitions)?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
Community Engagement and Public Outreach	Does the project engage in project-level partnerships and collaboration with watershed communities in project development, design, and implementation (see community engagement continuum on page 19)?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
	Total			**60**

Monitoring Proposal Criteria

Category	Evaluation Question	Scoring	Multiplier	Total Possible Points
Addresses at least one of WRIA 8's High Priority Monitoring and Assessment Needs	Determine how well the proposal goals and objectives are directly and clearly aligned with at least one of WRIA 8's high priority monitoring and assessment needs (see WRIA 8 Prioritization for Monitoring and Assessment Funding).	High – 15 Medium – 7.5 Low – 0	1	15
Management Application, Prioritizing Chinook	How well does the project directly inform or advance actions and best management practices to recover Chinook in WRIA 8? Prioritizing Chinook (high) and also considering proposals to inform or advance other salmon species and/or watershed health (medium). •	High – 15 Medium – 7.5 Low – 0	1	15
Collaboration, Cooperative Partnerships, Cost-sharing	Does the proposal involve multi-agency collaboration or other forms of cooperative partnership and the contribution of in-kind resources from one or more of the proposing organizations or other grant source (e.g., labor, funds, or supplies)? •	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
Maintains Long-Term Monitoring	Does the proposal directly support ongoing and long-term monitoring efforts focused on WRIA 8 salmon recovery where a failure to implement the proposed work would result in a meaningful data gap?	High – 5 Medium – 2.5 Low – 0		5
Communication	Does the proposal include a clear plan for sharing monitoring results with targeted technical and non-technical audiences? • The messaging makes obvious practical management implications of the work • The communication format well tailored to the target audience(s) with a high likelihood to build awareness, understanding, and hopefully adoption of science-based salmon recovery actions. • The proposal includes the requested minimum communication components (mid-term report, final report, presentation to WRIA 8 TC and/or SRC)	High – 15 Medium – 7.5 Low – 0		15
Study Design and Data Management	Does the project demonstrate careful planning including a robust study design and data management plan? • Clearly defined and measurable goals and objectives? • Appropriate sequencing relative to other monitoring work • Uses reliable methods with a high likelihood of achieving objectives	High – 15 Medium – 7.5 Low – 0		15
	Total			**75**

Outreach and Education Proposal Criteria

Category	Evaluation Question	Scoring	Multiplier	Total Possible Points
Supports WRIA 8 Outreach and Education Priorities	Assess how well proposal supports the priorities articulated in the WRIA 8 Communications & Outreach Framework Document	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
Design, Scope, Goals and Objectives	Does the proposal contain a clear description of the project's design, goals, scope and objectives?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
Audience and Approach	How well does the proposed approach for engaging key audiences support the goals and associated strategies/activities in the WRIA 8 Communications and Outreach Framework?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
Builds Support and Capacity for Salmon Recovery Actions	Assess how well the project builds support and capacity for salmon recovery actions. Does the proposal include a clear strategy to build support through targeted messaging and/or clearly contribute to implementation of habitat actions or best management practices?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
Builds Outreach and Education Capacity	How well does the program build outreach and education capacity in the watershed?	High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0	1	10
Equity and Environmental Justice	Will the strategies or methods used advance objectives of equity and environmental justice (See definitions on page 20)?	High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0	1	5
	Total			**55**