

# Snake River Lead Entity *Project Evaluation Criteria* - 2019

Project Title

Project Location:

Is the Project in the right area?	Project Tier	Points Possible	Description	Score	
					<i>Applications that contain multiple project sites that are not all in the same priority area will be averaged based on each site location</i>
	Tier I	45 to 50	Imminent threats or Habitat Project(s) in an MSA and within a priority restoration/protection reach (and the project type matches the particular priority restoration/protection reach designation)		
	Tier II	35 to 40	Project(s) in an MSA but not in a priority reach (project type does not match the particular priority restoration or protection reach designation) , or in mSA with a priority restoration reach		
	Tier III	25 to 30	Projects in an mSA and within a priority protection reach		
	Tier IV	15 to 20	Project(s) in an mSA but not in a priority reach		
Tier V	10	Project(s) not in an mSA			

Habitat Factors Addressed: \_\_\_\_\_

How well is the project addressing limiting factors?	Project Tier	Points Possible	Description	Score	
					<i>The habitat factors are listed in Table 14; Imminent Threat Projects are not scored here.</i>
	Tier I	21 to 30	Project is in an MSA that addresses 3 or more of the priority habitat factors		
	Tier II	11 to 20	Project is in an MSA that address 2 of the priority habitat factors or is in an mSA and address two or more of the following protection strategies: upland, riparian, and water conservation		
Tier III	0 to 10	Project is in an MSA that address 1 of the priority habitat factors or is in an mSA and address one of the following protection strategies: upland, riparian, or water conservation			

Imminent Threat:

Does this project address an imminent threat? (Implementation only, not for assessments or designs)	Barriers	Project Tier	Points Possible	Description	Score	
						<i>The SRSRB RTT will determine if a project would likely address an imminent threat at the population scale ("I") or at the local scale ("i")</i>
		Tier I	45 to 50	Project addresses an Imminent threat based on impacts at a population scale (I) and >1000' of useable habitat is opened		
		Tier II	35 to 40	Project addresses an Imminent threat based on impacts at a population scale (I) and <1000 of useable habitat is opened		
		Tier III	21-30	Project is presumed to address an imminent threat based on a local scale (i)		
	Tier IV	0	Project does not address an Imminent threat			
	Screens & Diversions	Tier I	31 to 50	Project addresses an Imminent threat based on impacts at a population scale (I)		
		Tier II	11-30	Project addresses and imminent threats based on a local scale (i)		
		Tier III	0	Project does not address an Imminent threat		

Project Certainty

Will the project work?	Project Tier	Points Possible	Description	Score
	Tier I	11 to 20	Project/assessment is based on proven scientific methods and will meet the intended objectives	
	Tier II	1 to 10	Project/assessment is based on unproven methods but will likely meet its intended objectives	
	Tier III	0	Project/assessment is based on proven scientific methods but will not likely meet intended objectives OR is based on speculative methods and will not likely meet its intended objectives	

**Project Size**

Restoration Projects: Is the on the ground project large enough to make a significant difference?  ("0" for Assessments and Designs Projects, scored separately below)			<b>Description</b> <i>This section is to reward projects that are large and address multiple ubiquitous limiting factors; the points are additive to points received on page 1 and are additive across project types (assessments/designs do not receive any points; appropriate design-build projects will be scored as an implementation project).</i>	
	Riparian	10 to 12	>50 acres	Score
		6 to 9	25-49 acres	
		3 to 5	10-24 acres	
		2	<10 acres	
	Instream Flow (Saved & Trusted) (during fish critical period)	10 to 12	>2 CFS	Score
		6 to 9	>1 but < 2 CFS	
		3 to 5	>0.5 but <1 CFS	
1 or 2		<0.5 CFS		
Irrigation Diversions Screened (Diversions Identified)	10 to 12	>2 CFS	Score	
	6 to 9	>1 but < 2 CFS		
	3 to 5	>0.5 but <1 CFS		
	1 or 2	<0.5 CFS		
Instream Habitat	10 to 12	>1,000 lineal feet	Score	
	6 to 9	500 to 999 feet		
	3 to 5	200 to 499 feet		
	1 or 2	< 200 feet		
Upland Best Management Practices	10 to 12	> 200 acres	Score	
	6 to 9	100 to 199 acres		
	3 to 5	50 to 99 acres		
	1 or 2	< 50 acres		
Conservation Easements <sup>1</sup>	0 to 10	Likelihood of development <sup>1</sup> is high based on information provided by sponsor	Score	
	0	Likelihood of development <sup>1</sup> is moderate based on information provided by sponsor		
	-10 to 0	Likelihood of development <sup>1</sup> is low based on information provided by sponsor		

**Designs, Assessments, and Monitoring**

Designs, Assessments, and Monitoring  ("0" for Restoration Projects, scored separately above)	Project Tier	Points Possible	<b>Description</b> Assessments must either lead to a project or fill an identified data gap and monitoring projects must meet Manual 18 requirements.	
	Tier I	31-40	Design and/or Assessment of an imminent threat (fish passage barrier, screen, ford, de-watered reach) that <b>will</b> directly lead to a project	
	Tier II	31-40	Design and/or Assessments of stream/riparian/floodplain habitat that will identify protection or restoration actions in respectively designated priority reach at the watershed or subwatershed level; Monitoring fills a key data gap in a priority area	
	Tier III	21-30	Design and/or Assessment to address addresses 3 or more of the priority habitat factors	
	Tier IV	11-20	Design and/or Assessment to address 2 or more of the priority habitat factors	
	Tier V	1-10	Design and/or Assessment of public interest in habitat protection or restoration projects.	Score
	Tier VI	1-10	Design and/or Assessments of stream/riparian/floodplain habitat that will identify protection or restoration actions in an area not designated a priority reach; Monitoring fills a key data gap in a non-priority area	

**Cost Benefit and Cost Share**

Cost Benefit	Project Tier	Points Possible	Description	
	Cost/Benefit	up to 10	Committee may assign up to 10 points for cost:benefit relationship based on community values, past experience with project costs, perceived project value relative to other proposed projects, number of ESA listed species and other considerations.	Score

Cost Share  Cost share must be documented with high certainty	Tier I	0	Minimum match met; or high uncertainty of additional match	
	Tier II	1-2	20-25% for Restoration/Design/Assessment/Monitoring Projects; Design only 10-15%	Score
	Tier III	3-4	26-30% for Restoration/Design/Assessment/Monitoring Projects; Design only 16-20%	
	Tier IV	5	30%+ for Restoration/Design/Assessment/Monitoring Projects; Design only 20%+	

**Total Project Score**

Lead Entity Committee  
 Member Signature \_\_\_\_\_