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 (WR8A) Chinook Salmon Recovery Plan (WR8A 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 WR8A 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 a number of 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.”

- Monitoring proposals and studies not linked to project development will be evaluated using the “Monitoring” criteria. Assessments that are intended to support habitat projects or acquisitions will be evaluated using the project criteria.

- Outreach and education proposals will receive an “outreach and education” score.
WRIA 8 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
o 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**
  o 10: Proposal addresses those factors known to be most limiting to salmon survival and productivity at the project scale
  o 5 – 9: Proposal partially addresses ecological concerns
  o 0 – 4: Proposal insufficient to address ecological concerns

- **Acquisition Project Scoring**
  o 10: Proposal will protect high quality habitat and preserve existing ecological function
  o 5 – 9: Proposal will protect some high quality habitat or an area planned for restoration actions that will result in high quality habitat
  o 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**
  o 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)
  o 5 – 9: Proposal suggests ecological concerns will be partially addressed
  o 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) Temporal Effect of the Proposed Action

The WRIA 8 Plan recommends restoration actions that protect and restore functional ecosystem processes. As a component of that, the certainty of success of an action is influenced by the longevity of the benefit provided and whether benefits will be self-maintaining or require future intervention or maintenance.

- **Restoration Implementation Project Scoring**
  - 8 – 10: Project should persist for decades with little or no maintenance
  - 4 – 7: Benefits will persist for up to one or two decades; maintenance is likely necessary
  - 0 – 3: Ongoing maintenance is necessary and benefits will be short-lived

- **Acquisition Project Scoring**
  - 8 – 10: Target site(s) to be acquired in fee and will provide functional habitat with little or no future restoration (e.g., invasive treatment/replanting only) or property faces significant near-term threat
4) 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

5) Community Involvement and Public Outreach

Effectively reaching out to and involving the local community, neighbors, and stakeholders in project development, design, and implementation can be an important to the success of a project. This is especially critical for projects with significant risks or constraints. Appropriate outreach and involvement will vary by project type, size, location, and identified risks/constraints.

- **Scoring (all proposals)**
  - 5: Project or activity incorporates direct engagement with the local community and relevant stakeholders (e.g., solicits meaningful input into project development or design, involves volunteer restoration or other onsite education events, etc.) and can demonstrate some outreach/engagement has already occurred
  - 2 – 4: Community/public outreach is focused on raising awareness or soliciting feedback
  - 0 – 1: No community or stakeholder outreach or involvement

6) Equity and Social Justice

Salmon recovery activities should be driven by the needs of the species, but where projects are occurring in or near underserved areas, or where underserved populations or cultural values could be incorporated into the project, every effort should be made to do so.
• **Scoring (all proposals)**
  - 5: Project or activity incorporates meaningful outreach and engagement with underserved groups or culturally-significant populations, and those values are addressed in project design or implementation
  - 2 – 4: Some outreach with underserved groups is planned
  - 0 – 1: Very limited or no outreach or engagement with underserved populations

**7) 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

**8) 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

**9) Protection/Restoration Strategy Realized with Implementation**

Score 5 points where implementation will complete a reach-scale protection/restoration strategy.
WRJA 8 Riparian Habitat/Stewardship Project Scoring Criteria

Benefits to Chinook

1) Cedar Population

The Cedar population is WRJA 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) WRJA 8 Tier

All areas within the WRJA 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 for Juvenile Chinook

The life history stage which data show to be most habitat-limited in WRJA 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.

• Scoring

  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.

• Scoring

  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) Temporal Effect of the Proposed Action

The WRIA 8 Plan recommends restoration actions that protect and restore functional ecosystem processes. As a component of that, the certainty of success of an action is influenced by the longevity of the benefit provided and whether benefits will be self-maintaining or require future intervention or maintenance.

- Scoring
  - 8 – 10: Project should persist for decades with little or no maintenance
  - 4 – 7: Benefits will persist for up to one or two decades and maintenance is likely to be necessary
  - 0 – 3: Ongoing maintenance is necessary and benefits will be short-lived
4) 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

5) Community Involvement and Public Outreach

Effectively reaching out to and involving the local community, neighbors, and stakeholders in project development, design, and implementation can be an important to a project’s successful implementation. This is especially critical for projects with significant risks or constraints. Appropriate outreach and involvement will vary by project.

- **Scoring**
  - 5: Project or activity incorporates direct engagement with the local community and relevant stakeholders (e.g., solicits meaningful input into project development and design, involves volunteer restoration or other onsite education events, etc.) and can demonstrate some outreach/engagement has already occurred
  - 2 – 4: Community/public outreach is focused on raising awareness or soliciting feedback
  - 0 – 1: No community or stakeholder outreach or involvement

6) Equity and Social Justice

Salmon recovery activities should be driven by the needs of the species, but where projects are occurring in or near underserved areas, or where underserved populations or cultural values could be incorporated into the project, every effort should be made to do so.

- **Scoring**
  - 5: Project or activity incorporates meaningful outreach and engagement with underserved groups or culturally-significant populations, and those values are addressed in project design or implementation
  - 2 – 4: Some outreach with underserved groups is planned
  - 0 – 1: Very limited or no outreach or engagement with underserved populations

7) 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**
o 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.

o 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.

o 0 – 1: Measurement is limited to outputs (assessing what was implemented) or the proposal does not define a measurement strategy or metrics.

8) Protection/Restoration Strategy Realized with Implementation

Score 5 points where implementation will complete a reach-scale riparian restoration strategy.
WRIA 8 Monitoring Proposal Criteria

1) Consistency with WRIA 8 Monitoring Priorities (see Appendix A of the 2017 WRIA 8 Plan)
   - Scoring
     o 10: Proposal directly supports WRIA 8 monitoring priorities
     o 5 – 9: Proposal is for a monitoring activity not explicitly identified in the WRIA 8 Plan but is consistent with WRIA 8 priorities
     o 0 – 4: Proposal demonstrates a lack of understanding of WRIA 8 monitoring priorities or is inconsistent with those priorities

2) Monitoring Design, Scope, Goals, Objectives, and Metrics
   - Scoring
     o 10: Proposal is clearly defined, identifies measureable goals and objectives, is appropriately sequenced relative to other monitoring work, and demonstrates high feasibility of being implemented
     o 5 – 9: Proposals may not be completely clear, the scope and design may be too broad, or the metrics may be difficult to measure
     o 0 – 4: Proposal is unclear, may not be feasible, or proposes something unmeasurable

3) Scale of Impact and Usefulness
   - Scoring
     o 10: Proposal informs other WRIA 8 monitoring efforts, contributes directly to project development, or seeks to understand a critical data gap that has watershed-wide implications or major implications for one of the two WRIA 8 Chinook populations
     o 5 – 9: Proposal is limited to improving site-specific understanding or has limited usefulness beyond the proposal
     o 0 – 4: Proposal is inconsistent with other WRIA 8 monitoring efforts or will provide little information of value to WRIA 8 recovery efforts

4) Ongoing Monitoring and Importance of the Information
   - Scoring
     o 10: Proposal supports ongoing monitoring and if not collected would result in a critical WRIA 8 data gap
     o 5 – 9: Proposal supports ongoing monitoring, yet some of the data could continue to be collected by others
     o 0 – 4: Lack of this information would not result in a data gap or the information will be of limited utility
1) Design, Scope, Goals, and Objectives

- **Scoring**
  - 8 – 10: Proposal has clear objectives, achievable design, and measurable outcomes
  - 4 – 7: Proposal does not have completely clear objectives, the design is too broad, and/or outcomes are difficult to manage
  - 0 – 3: Proposal is unclear, unfocused, and unmeasurable

2) Audience and Approach

There are numerous audiences in the watershed to which outreach and education programs can be targeted to support implementation of the WRIA 8 Plan. Proposals should clearly identify and target appropriate audiences and demonstrate their importance to salmon recovery. High priority outreach and education audiences include:

- General public / watershed residents
- Streamside and lakeshore property owners
- Elected officials
- Businesses – specifically construction (e.g., builders and contractors) and green industries (e.g., landscape architects and designers)
- Youth
- Recreational boaters
- Funders/grantors

- **Scoring**
  - 8 – 10: Proposal identifies and demonstrates knowledge of high priority salmon recovery audience(s) and proposes a targeted approach to engaging the audience(s)
  - 4 – 7: Proposal targets a less critical salmon recovery audience, demonstrates limited knowledge of the identified audience, or proposes an unclear approach
  - 0 – 3: Proposal does not clearly identify an audience or demonstrate a targeted outreach and education approach

3) Supports WRIA 8 Outreach and Education Priorities (see Appendix I of the 2017 WRIA 8 Plan)

- **Scoring**
  - 8 – 10: Proposal directly supports outreach and activities identified in Appendix I
  - 4 – 7: Proposal indirectly supports priorities identified in Appendix I
  - 0 – 3: Proposal is not consistent with outreach and education priorities in Appendix I
4) Builds Support and Capacity for Salmon Recovery Actions

- **Scoring**
  - 8 – 10: Proposal includes a clear strategy to build support through targeted messaging and/or clearly contributes to implementation of habitat actions or best management practices, and can demonstrate results
  - 4 – 7: Proposal includes a strategy that is somewhat unclear or will not contribute to building support for implementation of habitat actions or best management practices, and/or will have difficulty demonstrating results
  - 0 – 3: Proposal offers an unclear strategy, contribution to implementation of habitat actions or best management practices will be limited at best, and it does not seem likely to be able to demonstrate results

5) Builds Outreach and Education Capacity

- **Scoring**
  - 8 – 10: Proposal builds on lessons learned and results from previous efforts, enhances existing outreach and education efforts, builds partnerships, and/or creates models for future programs
  - 4 – 7: Proposal takes some steps towards building on existing lessons learned or creating partnerships
  - 0 – 3: Proposal takes limited or no steps toward building on lessons learned or results from previous efforts, and does not create partnerships
### Restoration/Protection Project Scoring Criteria – Benefit to Chinook

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Possible Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Cedar River Chinook Population</td>
<td>Will the project provide benefits to the Cedar River Chinook population (includes all freshwater habitat used by the Cedar population)?</td>
<td>Yes – 10 No – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRIA 8 Tier</td>
<td>Is the project located in Tier 1, 2, or 3?</td>
<td>Tier 1 – 10 Tier 2 – 5 Tier 3 – 1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit to Habitat Features for Juvenile Chinook</td>
<td>Does the project demonstrate that it will enhance, create, or otherwise provide lift to a habitat type that is limiting to juvenile Chinook salmon?</td>
<td>High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addresses Primary Ecological Concerns or Limiting Factor(s)</td>
<td>Does the proposed project address the primary ecological concern(s) most relevant at the site?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Ecosystem Processes</td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale of the Project</td>
<td>What is the size of the proposed project? Cutoffs are as follows:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Large – Cedar: 20 acres or greater; other streams: 10 acres or greater; OR linear feet &gt;50x avg bankfull width; Lake WA/Ship Canal and Nearshore: greater than 150 linear feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Small – Cedar: &lt;15 acres; other streams: &lt;5 acres; OR linear feet &lt;20x bankfull width; Lake WA/Ship Canal and Nearshore: &lt;75 feet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large – 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medium – 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Small – 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Restoration/Protection Project Scoring Criteria – Certainty of Success**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Possible Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach</strong></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>High – 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Restoration projects</strong> – Maximum points for proposals that are clear in describing the approach, uses appropriate methods, and has clear goals and objectives.</td>
<td>Medium – 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Acquisition projects</strong> – Maximum points for proposals clearly describing why acquisition is necessary and is preferable to other actions.</td>
<td>Low – 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Project planning and design</strong> – Maximum points for proposals clearly describing the problem and how the work being proposed will directly support project development or lead to design deliverables.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility, Readiness, and Sequence</strong></td>
<td>Does the proposed action seem feasible, demonstrate readiness for implementation, and occur in the appropriate sequence?</td>
<td>High – 10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Restoration projects</strong> – 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.</td>
<td>Medium – 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Acquisition projects</strong> – Maximum points for documented landowner willingness.</td>
<td>Low – 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Project planning and design</strong> – 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal Effect of the Proposed Action</strong></td>
<td>Will project benefits be self-maintaining, or will future intervention be required to provide benefits over time?</td>
<td>High – 10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Restoration projects</strong> – Maximum points for projects that should persist for decades with little or no maintenance.</td>
<td>Medium – 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Acquisition projects</strong> – Maximum points where target site(s) will be acquired in fee and will provide functional habitat with little or no future restoration.</td>
<td>Low – 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Project planning and design</strong> – Maximum points for proposals that are related to future activity that is conceptualized to offer self-maintaining and long-lived benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Scoring</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Is the overall cost low relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in the proposed location, and are individual budget items reasonable?</td>
<td>High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Involvement and Public Outreach</strong></td>
<td>Were key landowners, the local community, or other relevant stakeholders directly engaged during project development or design, will community input be solicited, or will the public be directly involved in project implementation?</td>
<td>High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity and Social Justice</strong></td>
<td>Does the project incorporate meaningful outreach and engagement with underserved groups or culturally important populations, and are these values being addressed in project design or implementation?</td>
<td>High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate Change</strong></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Evaluation (only to be applied to restoration projects)</strong></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategy Realized with Implementation</strong></td>
<td>Will implementing this proposal complete a reach-based protection or restoration strategy?</td>
<td>Yes – 5 No – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Riparian Habitat/Stewardship Project Scoring Criteria – Benefit to Chinook

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Evaluation Question</th>
<th>Scoring</th>
<th>Multiplier</th>
<th>Total Possible Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approach</strong></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Maximum points for proposals that are clear in describing the approach, use appropriate methods, and have clear goals and objectives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Feasibility, Readiness, and Sequence</strong></td>
<td>Is the proposed action feasible, demonstrate readiness for implementation, and occur in the appropriate sequence?</td>
<td>High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Temporal Effect of the Proposed Action</strong></td>
<td>Will project benefits be self-maintaining, or will future intervention be required to provide benefits over time?</td>
<td>High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Maximum points for projects that should persist for decades with little or no maintenance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td>Is the overall cost low relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in the proposed location, and are individual budget items reasonable?</td>
<td>High – 10 Medium – 5 Low – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Involvement and Public Outreach</strong></td>
<td>Were key landowners, the local community, or other relevant stakeholders directly engaged during project development or design, will community input be solicited, or will the public be directly involved in project implementation?</td>
<td>High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Equity and Social Justice</strong></td>
<td>Does the project incorporate meaningful outreach and engagement with underserved groups or culturally-important populations, and are these values being addressed in project design or implementation?</td>
<td>High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Evaluation (only to be applied to restoration projects)</strong></td>
<td>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?</td>
<td>High – 5 Medium – 3 Low – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategy Realized with Implementation</td>
<td>Will implementing this proposal complete a reach-based protection or restoration strategy?</td>
<td>Yes – 5 No – 0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>