

PROJECT PROPOSAL SCREENING AND PROJECT SCORING TEMPLATE (PST)

Project Screening – *Project “Musts”*

These all need to be YES for the project to move onto category scoring.

1. **Limiting Factors Alignment** | YES or NO
Which limiting factors are present? Are the top three cited? Do sponsor identified **limiting factors on site align** with ASRP GSU designation and priority for correction?
2. **Actions Alignment** | YES or NO
What restoration and protection actions are emphasized for this location? Do sponsor-identified **restoration actions on site align** with ASRP GSU designation and priority for correction?
3. **Landowner Support** | YES or NO
Is (are) the landowner(s) interested and willing to participate? Are there signed landowner acknowledgement forms? Adjacent landowner acknowledgment encouraged, but not required.
4. **Land Use Compatibility** | YES or NO
What are the dominant land uses? Is project proposal **feasible with** current and projected **on-site land uses**?
5. **Budget Detail** | YES or NO
Does the proposal’s budget provide **sufficient detail to determine** whether or not projected **expenses are realistic** to achieve the project’s stated goals?

Project Scoring Template (PST) – *Categories, Weights, and Criteria*

Weight based on understanding of current program priorities/policies (see category weight numerical value guidance). Some evaluation categories may be optional depending on project type, while other evaluation categories are required. Each evaluation category is given a score value on a 5 to 1 scale basis (see score value guidance).

1. **Location** | Weight = 10, Highest Importance | Eval. Required | Alignment 5 to 1
Is the project within a **ASRP Priority Areas GSU**? What’s the project’s nexus to a ASRP Priority Areas GSU?
2. **Limiting Factors** | Weight = 8, Elevated Importance | Eval. Required | Alignment 5 to 1
What opportunities have you identified to address the limiting factors? Do the actions proposed **address stated ASRP limiting factors**?
3. **Ecosystem Process** | Weight = 8, Elevated Importance | Eval. Required | Expectations 5 to 1
Does design approach and project citing holistically protect or restore **ecosystem processes** both within and proximal to the project footprint? Does design approach and project citing protect and/or restore **riparian processes and functions** including cover; shade; inputs of large wood, leaf litter, and insect inputs to the aquatic food web; sediment and erosion functions; and nutrient and pollutant trapping and filtering?

4. **Physical Process** | Weight = 8, Elevated Importance | Eval. Required | Expectations 5 to 1
Does design approach and project citing protect and/or restore **natural physical riverine processes** including channel migration, sediment and wood transport, etc.? Does the design approach and project citing protect and/or restore **floodplain processes and functions** including connectivity, hyporheic exchange, etc.?
5. **Aquatic Habitat Enhancement** | Weight = 2, Lower Importance | Eval. Optional | Expectations 5 to 1
Would the project significantly increase quality of and access to **instream habitat for aquatic species** (including habitat needs for migration, reproduction, rearing and feeding, and overwintering habitats)?
6. **Aquatic Habitat Protection** | Weight = 5, Normal Importance | Eval. Optional | Expectations 5 to 1
Does the project **protect** and enhance existing functioning **core habitats** for species across their life history trajectories? This includes acquisitions, easements, and project agreements. Consider Extent, Duration, and Location scoring guidance below.

Extent

- 5 **Greatly Exceeds** – Way beyond the regulations for site control. Converts the whole CMZ to protected areas.
- 4 **Exceeds** – Moves above the current regulations and protects all the modern valley bottom, but less than the CMZ.
- 3 **Meets** – Fits within the current state regulations; no exceptions to the regulations are needed. Some compromise on protection of the modern valley bottom (e.g., variable widths). But much more than the site potential tree height everywhere.
- 2 **Somewhat Meets** – Only protection on one side of the river. Sacrifices on the regulations (i.e., grandfathering in structures or practices). Less than all the modern valley bottom protected (e.g., less than ½ the width). Buffer on par with the site potential tree height at a minimum for smaller channels.
- 1 **Does Not Meet** – Buffer width less than the annual channel migration rate or way less than the site potential tree height.

Duration

- 5 **Greatly Exceeds** – Acquisition by Land Trust or similar with no chance of development ever.
- 4 **Exceeds** – Combination of in perpetuity easement or acquisition.
- 3 **Meets** – In perpetuity easement or a long-term easement in a very good location. Low chance of development conversion in long term.
- 2 **Somewhat Meets** – Long-term easement (e.g., 25-year or 50-year).
- 1 **Does Not Meet** – LOA only, not really a long-term property protection approach.

Location

- 5 **Greatly Exceeds** – Big river or high-priority near-term area.
- 4 **Exceeds** – More important than most areas for protection. In near- or mid-term priority areas.
- 3 **Meets** – In a near-, mid-, or long-term priority area.
- 2 **Somewhat Meets** – On a creek/river in the Chehalis Basin.
- 1 **Does Not Meet** – Not along a waterway or covering a wetland.

7. Climate Change Resilience | Weight = 5, Normal Importance | Eval. Required | Expectations 5 to 1

Does the project increase watershed **resiliency to climate change** by protecting and improving natural water quantity and timing characteristics and water quality characteristics? Does the proposed project infrastructure accommodate future flood flows and channel widths? See below for scoring guidance.

5 Greatly Exceeds – Innovative project that goes well beyond expectations in a combination of spatial and temporal scale, methods to protect and enhance water quantity and quality both now and late century, and location within the basin in a high-priority near-term area.

4 Exceeds – Project is proposed to explicitly address climate change and is developed to increase refugia, lower water temperatures, and/or allow for future projected geomorphology and hydrology process in a priority area. The project incorporates a combination of actions to address future climate and is ambitious enough in scope to be impactful.

3 Meets – Fits within the known restoration treatments that will work to increase resiliency to climate change. Some compromise on location or known site-specific criteria to inform likelihood of success. Makes mention of existing tools available to adapt project to future climate and hydrology.

2 Somewhat Meets – Fits somewhat within the known restoration treatments that will work to increase resiliency to climate change. Reviewer has to infer that this is the case; proposal does not explicitly speak to climate change.

1 Does Not Meet – Project does not tangibly address climate change and may lower resiliency to it.

8. Cost v. Benefit | Weight = 8, Elevated Importance | Eval. Required | Expectations 5 to 1

Does the project have a **reasonable cost relative to the predicted benefits** for the project type in that location?

9. Certainty of Success | Weight = 2, Lower Importance | Eval. Required | Expectations 5 to 1

How **probable** is the project to perform as expected over time? How **inconsequential** would the project underperforming be to its surroundings or **perception of the program**? Certainty of success includes: a) landowner and **community acceptance**; b) **long-term sustainability and resiliency to natural disturbance**; c) risk of **causing off-site impacts**; and d) general uncertainty and **adaptive management planning/capacity**.

Score Value Guidance – *Classic Likert Scale Approach*

Expectations	Alignment
5 Greatly Exceeds	5 Strongly Aligned
4 Exceeds	4 Aligned
3 Meets	3 Neutral
2 Somewhat Meets	2 Misaligned
1 Does Not Meet	1 Directly Opposing

Category Weight Numeric Value Guidance – *Provides Distinction Between Categories***Category Weights**

10 Highest Importance	5 Normal Importance	0 Not Applicable
8 Elevated Important	2 Lower Importance	