

## ATTACHMENT 5 – EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR PROJECTS

To help ensure that every project funded by the Salmon Recovery Funding Board is technically sound, the Review Panel's technical advisors will note for the Review Panel and SRFB any projects they believe have low benefit to salmon, a low likelihood of being successful, or costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits of the project<sup>1</sup>. The technical advisors will not otherwise rate, score, or rank projects. The Review Panel technical members will take into account that at the time of application to the SRFB, some restoration projects will not have been completely designed and some acquisition projects may not have specific parcels identified. It is expected that projects will follow best management practices when available, and will meet any state and federal permitting requirements.

### **Criteria**

For restoration and protection projects, the technical advisors will advise the Review Panel that a project is not technically sound and cannot be significantly improved if:

1. It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing.
2. Information provided, or current understanding of the system, is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
3. The project is dependent on other key conditions or processes being addressed first.
4. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor and lead entity have failed to justify the costs.
5. The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
6. The project may be in wrong sequence with other habitat protection, assessments or restoration actions in the watershed.
7. The project uses a technique that has not been considered to be successful in the past.
8. It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated objectives.
9. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated objective.
10. There is low potential for threat to habitat conditions if the protection project is not completed.

---

<sup>1</sup> These projects will remain on the project lists evaluated by the Review Panel and forwards to the SRFB unless the lead entity decides to withdraw them. Only the SRFB has the authority to remove a project from the lead entity list.

11. The project design is not adequate or the project is improperly sited.
12. The stewardship plan is insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance of the project and this would likely jeopardize the project's success.
13. In addition to applying the above criteria, the technical advisors also will advise the Review Panel if they believe the project has not been shown to address an important habitat condition or watershed process in the area or if the project's main focus is to support other needs such as general education, property protection or water supply.
14. For assessment projects, the project will be red-flagged by the technical advisors if:
  15. It is not clear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing.
  16. The project does not address an information need important to understanding the watershed, is not directly relevant to project development or sequencing, and will not clearly lead to beneficial projects.
  17. The methodology does not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project.
  18. The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits.
  19. The assessment does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed, or may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat assessment or restoration activities.
  20. The assessment uses a technique that has not been proven successful in past applications.
  21. There are significant constraints to the implementation of high priority project(s) following completion of the assessment.
  22. It is unclear how the assessment will achieve its stated objectives.
  23. It is unlikely that the assessment will achieve its stated objective.
24. In addition to applying the above criteria, the technical advisors also will advise the Review Panel if they believe the project minimally addresses a limiting life history stage or habitat type that limits salmon productivity or its main focus is to support other needs such as general education, property protection, or water supply.