

Watershed Workgroup Review Criteria

Program Priorities

The overriding criterion for prioritizing watershed projects is that the project should directly contribute to the recovery of anadromous salmonid populations in the Trinity River and its tributaries. Proposals should demonstrate a high probability of contributing to recovery of anadromous species, especially through mitigation of existing threats or factors inhibiting recovery of the species. The following guidelines, developed in the April 2008 TRRP Watershed WG meeting, are intended to guide project selection:

- Sediment control projects that exclude a larger quantity of fine sediment relative to the local fine sediment budget have higher priority.
- Sediment control projects with a lower cost per unit sediment excluded have higher priority.
- Projects that are identified by or are consistent with existing watershed plans, including the Northwest Forest Plan, the Trinity River TMDL, or State Water Quality Control Plans, will be given higher priority.
- Projects with complete planning (NEPA/CEQA) and permitting documents, or demonstrate that documents will be complete by projected start date, will be given higher priority.
- Projects that provide multiple fishery benefits will be given higher priority.
- Projects that leverage matching funds from other sources have higher priority.

Proposals should not be prioritized based upon project type but rather by their potential for restoring anadromous fisheries.

Project Eligibility

Projects should be consistent with the Implementation Plan for the Preferred Alternative of the Trinity River EIS/EIR (Appendix C of the Trinity River FEIS/EIR).

A. Evaluation Criteria

The proposals will be evaluated by reviewers based on the following criteria as described below (with their relative weights):

1. Benefit to Restoring Anadromous Fish Populations (40%).

The proposal addresses a restoration need documented for the target species, age-class, and location (site, reach, watershed) and the beneficial response of anadromous fish species will be maintained over a reasonable if not permanent duration. Applications will be evaluated on clear identification of project goals and objectives and applicability of those goals and objectives to conservation and recovery goals for anadromous species. Reviewers will also score the proposal based on their consideration of the contribution of potential outcomes, results, or

products to species conservation and management goals; whether milestones and products are clearly identified; and whether performance measures for evaluating effectiveness of the completed project were clearly identified. (Score: 1-10 points; where, for example, 1= no importance/relevance to the program goals or objectives, very limited potential to contribute to anadromous species recovery; 5= moderately important/ relevant, and likely to make a moderate contribution to anadromous species recovery; 10= extremely important/relevant, and likely to make a significant contribution to anadromous species recovery.)

2. Technical Merit (35%).

The proposal addresses whether the approach is appropriate for achieving the stated goals and objectives, whether the approach will result in successful execution of the project, and if the anticipated results can be achieved in the time line specified. Reviewers will consider whether sufficient information is provided to evaluate the design of the project relative to the stated goals/objectives. (Score: 1-10 points; where, for example, 1= completely unsound and/ or unlikely to meet the stated objectives, application instructions were not followed, and no performance measures included; 5= intermediately sound, and/ or reasonably likely to meet the stated objectives, application instructions generally followed; 10= extremely sound and highly likely to meet the stated objectives, application instructions followed thoroughly.)

3. Project Costs (15%).

This criterion evaluates the budget to determine if it is sufficiently detailed, realistic, commensurate with the project needs and time-frame, and the extent to which this project leverages funds from other sources. The itemized costs and the overall budget must be adequately justified and appropriately allocated. The proposal identifies cost share source(s), type (cash or in-kind), the status of the cost share (secured, pending [if pending, the date a decision is expected to be made]), and the dollar amount/percent share of total cost (Score: 1-10 points; where, for example, 1= unrealistic and lacking sufficient detail, poor value for dollar; 5= adequately detailed and realistic, intermediate value for dollar; 10= extremely detailed and realistic, good value for dollar).

4. Overall Qualification of Applications (10%).

This criterion addresses whether the applicant possesses the necessary expertise, experience, facilities, and administrative resources to accomplish the project. Reviewers will consider previous related experience and qualifications of the project's PM or PI, Co-Manager(s) or Co-Investigator(s) and other personnel, including designated contractors, consultants, and cooperators. Reviewers will also consider past award performance of the applicant(s) and PM/PI. (Score: 1-10 points; where, for example, 1= completely unqualified and/or lacking the resources or capacity to accomplish the project, 5= intermediate level of qualifications or experience and/or adequate resources and capacity to accomplish the project, 10= extremely qualified/ experienced, has all necessary resources and demonstrated capacity to accomplish the project.)