|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Chehalis Basin Lead Entity** | | Riparian-Specific Guidance |  |  |
| **2024** |  | Details reviewers will look at in evaluating riparian projects are highlighted in Green |  |  |
| **Category** | **Criteria** | **Guidance** | **Total Possible Points** | **Project Score** |
| **Overall Benefit** | 1) Critical Need | Does the proposal make a strong, scientifically supported, case for the need for this project? | 6 |  |
|  | 1a) Does the proposal identify need, such as an imminent or existing threat to important salmonid habitat that will be addressed?  Riparian specifics: Examples: warm stream temperature; encroachment of invasive species, lack of natural succession, terrestrial inputs into stream | (2) |  |
|  |  | 1b) Does the proposal clearly articulate how the action will address the threat? | (2) |  |
|  |  | 1c) Is the proposed action cited in or supported by adopted conservation and recovery plans, habitat assessments or other relevant documentation?   Riparian specifics: Full points for riparian projects at locations identified in a riparian assessment. Example documentation sources: Beechie - Riparian Index; Riparian index based on Ken Pearce -- in Coast Salmon Partnership's Climate Resilience Index. | (2) |  |
|  | 2) Species | Will the project protect or restore habitat for multiple salmonid species and/or rare populations? | 6 |  |
|  |  | 2a) Does the project protect or restore habitat for multiple salmon species? | (4) |  |
|  |  | 2b) Does the project protect or restore habitat for a rare salmon species?   *(Spring Chinook, Winter Steelhead and Bull Trout are considered rare in 2024)* | (1) |  |
|  |  | 2c) Has fish use been documented? | (1) |  |
|  | 3) Life History Benefits | Will the project benefit multiple salmonid life history stages?  Riparian specific: Must demonstrate how the action benefits multiple life histories (including spawning) for full points. E.g. planting trees in lower mainstem only benefit rearing/outmigration, so won’t get full points. | 6 |  |
|  | 4) Watershed Processes and Habitat Features | Does the project protect or restore natural watershed processes that will improve habitat-forming and/or biological processes? | 6 |  |
|  |  | 4a) Is “Riparian” identified in a report or plan as a critical watershed process to restore in this location?? (full points if justification is tied to particular site) | (3) |  |
|  |  | 4b) Does the sponsor describe how riparian planting improves habitat-forming processes? | (2) |  |
|  |  | 4c) Does the project lead to full conversion of habitat – (e.g. from a farm field)? | (1) |  |
|  | 5) High Priority Areas and Actions | Does the proposal address a high priority action in a high-priority geographic area? | 6 |  |
|  |  | 5a) Is the project a high priority action? (max 4 pts)  Riparian specific: "Riparian" is a Tier 1 concern for Management Unit in the Lead Entity Strategy. | (4) |  |
|  |  | 5b) Is the project in a high priority area? (max 2 pts)  Riparian specific: Justification provided for being a high priority area. E.g. have an additional shade goal in a TMDL; Riparian Index from Beechie report or Climate Index | (2) |  |
|  | 6) Quantity of Benefit | Does the proposal quantify project benefits for target species? Will the project result in a major improvement or preservation of habitat function or species abundance/ diversity?  Riparian specifics: Full points only if buffer width reaches Site Potential Tree Height (WDFW tool shows what this should be).   For 1-5 points --- reviewers balance Stream Miles and Buffer Width - area weighted by average buffer width. Also consider species diversity, complexity. | 6 |  |
|  | 7) Synergy with Other Actions | Is the proposed project integrated with or complementing other restoration or protection actions in the subwatershed and is it expected to result in a clear, large net benefit (greater than the proposed project alone) because of this relationship?  Riparian specifics: Riparian project explicitly connected with other instream actions, culvert corrections, or part of a reach scale project would score high. | 6 |  |
|  | ***Subscore*** |  | ***42*** |  |
| **Certainty of Benefit** | 8) Approach / Science-Based | Is the proposed action consistent with proven scientific methods?   Riparian specifics: Full points if multiple species of trees/shrubs planted and proposal justifies selection of species. Considers natural succession. Considers methods for treating invasive species. | 3 |  |
| 9) Clear Goals and Objectives | Does the proposal include quantifiable actions, goals and SMART\* objectives? "SMART" = specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound | 3 |  |
| 10) Scope | Does the project scope appropriately cover all project elements necessary to develop, implement, and complete the project?  Riparian specific: Reviewers will be better able to answer this question with a Riparian Enhancement Plan, but not required. Complete monitoring and maintenance plan needed in scope to meet goal. | 3 |  |
|  | 11) Budget & Cost Effectiveness | Is the project budget realistic and does it contain sufficient detail? Is the project cost effective? Does the project leverage other funding sources? | 6 |  |
|  |  | 11a) Does the proposal’s budget provide sufficient detail to determine whether or not projected expenses are realistic to achieve the project’s stated goals | (1) |  |
|  |  | 11b) Does the project have a low cost a relative to the predicted benefits for the project type in that location? | (2) |  |
|  |  | 11c) Has the sponsor clearly leveraged available resources to reduce costs and maximize benefits (e.g., use of matching funds, volunteer labor, combining individual projects/tasks to reduce administrative costs, or other efficiencies). Match above and beyond the requirements.   Riparian specific: No match is required for riparian projects, so any match above and beyond counts for points. | (3) |  |
|  | ***Subscore*** |  | ***15*** |  |
| **Ability to Implement** | 12) Team Experience | Does the project sponsor have a demonstrated ability to complete projects as proposed, on time and according to budget? | 3 |  |
| 13) Schedule/ Sequence | Does the proposal include a logical sequence of actions and is the milestone schedule realistic? | 3 |  |
| 14) Permits | Are permits required for the project to proceed? If yes, what is the status of permit approval and is the permitting plan/schedule reasonable? | 3 |  |
|  | 15) Land owners | Do the participating and affected landowners support the project? | 3 |  |
|  | 16) Support Local Values | Does the proposal identify key stakeholders and document their support for the project? (i.e. documented support from social, economic, and cultural groups)? | 3 |  |
|  | 17) Long Term Education and Outreach | Will the project incorporate a long-term education/outreach program? Will the project foster a community conservation ethic through citizen involvement? | 4 |  |
|  | 18) Partnerships | Will the project benefit from a diverse, multi-stakeholder partnership? | 4 |  |
|  | **Subscore** |  | **23** |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Total** |  | **80** |  |