

SKAGIT WATERSHED COUNCIL
2011 SRFB Grant Proposals
Project Evaluation Criteria and Scoring

Criteria	Lower Scoring	Medium	Higher Scoring	Score	Weight	Total
Target Area ¹	Tier 3 – sediment and hydrology impaired watersheds (uplands)	Tier 2 – nearshore pocket estuaries; single Chinook population in freshwater; Tier 3 watersheds in Tier 2 floodplain target areas	Tier 1 – multiple Chinook populations	1,3,5	4	4-20
Watershed Processes and Habitat Features	Habitat creation ² or remediation; does not restore habitat-forming processes lowest scoring - not proven to address an important habitat condition	Addresses, protects or Improves habitat conditions but may not address the most important limiting factor; partial restoration ² of natural habitat-forming processes	Addresses, protects or restores high priority habitat ³ and/or restores watershed processes that form and sustain salmon habitats	1 – 5	3	3-15
Scale/benefits Restoration	Localized or limited action or impact	Potential for moderate increase in restoration of habitat area or juvenile capacity relative to targets	Potential for large increase in restoration of habitat area or juvenile capacity relative to targets (e.g. >10%)			
Acquisitions for Protection	Has not been demonstrated to protect an important habitat; site too small and adjacent acquisitions unlikely or insufficient to achieve protection goal	40-60% of total project area is intact habitat with plans for restoration; site too small to accommodate protection goal but further acquisitions nearby possible	More than 60 % of total project area is intact habitat, or is a key parcel in larger assemblage of protection acquisitions; size is sufficient quantity to accommodate goal	1 – 5	3	3-15
Assessments	Addresses a lower priority action or geographic area; information insufficient to determine if addresses an important habitat condition or data gap	Will lead to new projects in moderate priority areas. Fills an identified data gap	Is directly relevant to project development or sequencing and will clearly lead to new projects in high priority areas. Fills important data gap			
Scope	Scope not well matched to project goals or target area objectives	Scope is appropriate to meet some or many of the project goals and relevant target area objectives	Scope is appropriate to meet clearly articulated project goals and relevant target area objectives			
Methods	Employs questionable treatments, methods, or practices or those not proven to be effective	Uses methods that may have been tested but results are incomplete; or employs experimental treatments or methods with well developed rationale and experimental design	Employs accepted or tested standards, methods, or practices	1 – 5	2	2-10
Sequence	May be in the wrong sequence with other protection and restoration actions	Is dependent on other actions being taken first that are outside the scope of this project but are being addressed	Appropriate phase of multi-phased project; Is in the correct sequence, or is independent of other actions			
Cost Effectiveness	Costs are high or unrealistic relative to scope and location; costs unsubstantiated	Costs are reasonable relative to scope and location	Costs are well controlled; low cost relative to predicted benefits for project type and location; creative funding or efficiencies found	1 – 5	2	2-10
Certainty of Success	Uncertain or limited design life of habitat benefit; uncertainties not acknowledged or addressed; no adaptive management, maintenance or contingencies proposed	Project may require some maintenance; habitat benefit on the order of decades; uncertainties acknowledged; includes contingency for adaptive management or maintenance of site	High likelihood of project being self-sustaining; long term habitat benefit; the significant uncertainties well described; contingency for adaptive management or maintenance of site included as appropriate	1 – 5	2	2-10

¹ Skagit Watershed Council Year 2010 Strategic Approach; ² Table 2 in Strategic Approach; ³ Table 3 in Strategic Approach