

Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Lead Grant Evaluation Criteria

Investing in Riparian Restoration and Protection in Puget Sound

1. Scope of Proposed Work

Application questions

Fill in the fields and table below to describe the proposed Scope of Work for this application. A Scope of Work template with additional instructions is provided following Task 2.

In the fields and table below, provide a detailed Scope of Work that includes the information requested including task descriptions, budget, responsible party, periods of performance, deliverables, etc. See eligibility information in the Funding Guidelines for specific reporting requirements and eligible costs.

- **High: 20-30 points**
 - The scope of work includes well-considered, thoughtful tasks, descriptions, and timeline, and have clear directions towards the goals of the proposal.
 - The proposal describes admirable goals, outcomes, and deliverables.
 - The tasks and deliverables described in the scope of work will likely accomplish the stated objectives.
 - The tasks are logically sequenced and the timelines are achievable.
- **Med: 10-19 points**
 - The proposal includes a description of a workplan, methodology, and timeline with some missing clarity or logic in the description of the tasks (activities) and deliverables (products) necessary to successfully implement the full proposal.
 - The proposal describes good goals, outcomes, and deliverables.
 - The tasks and deliverables described in the scope of work may or may not accomplish the stated objectives.
 - The tasks are not well sequenced and the timelines are either too ambitious or somewhat loose.
- **Low: 1-9 points**
 - The scope of work lacks clarity in key details in either the workplan, methodology, or overall goals of the proposal.
 - The proposal describes admirable goals, outcomes, and deliverables.
 - It is unlikely that the tasks and deliverables described in the scope of work will accomplish the stated objectives.
 - The tasks are not logically sequenced and/or the timelines are unachievable.

2. Budget Detail and Budget Narrative

Application questions

Download a copy and complete the Budget spreadsheet provided in EAGL to include the amount of proposed project costs by spending category and tasks included along with this application. The budget template provides definitions of each spending categories and eligible costs. The administration category may not exceed 15% of the total project cost. For more information about eligible costs, visit the Funding Guidelines. The task information should align with those referenced in the Scope of Proposed Work section in this application. Once completed, place the Budget Spreadsheet in the uploads section of EAGL.

- **High: 7-10 points**
 - The proposed costs are reasonable, the timeline is realistic, and the amount of work and partners are right sized for the proposed workplan.

- The budget information is clearly presented and the costs and assumptions are reasonable.
- **Medium: 4-6 points**
 - The proposed costs are either a little bit high or low, but still seem reasonable overall. The timeline may be a little ambitious or lacking, but the partners and the workplan are still clear.
 - The budget information is mostly clear and the costs and assumptions are somewhat reasonable.
- **Low: 1-3 points**
 - The proposed budget is unclear or illogical, and the proposed costs are not very cost effective.
 - The budget information is unclear and some of the costs and assumptions are problematic.

3. Leverage

Application questions

Describe other sources of funding that are a part of your programmatic approach to riparian management in your focus area. Match is not required but additional leveraged funding is encouraged.

- **High: 4- 5 points**
 - The proposal clearly describes the other resources that will be leveraged for this source of funding.
 - Other sources of funding that could be leveraged along with this work if it is approved are fully documented and shared as part of the programmatic approach.
- **Medium: 2-3 points**
 - There are some other sources of funding described, or the descriptions include work that might be done by other funding sources.
 - Other sources of funding are vaguely described that may or may not be leveraged along with this work if it is approved and are somewhat documented and shared as part of the programmatic approach.
- **Low: 1 point**
 - No other sources of funding are described, or the descriptions lack a unique nature for this funding source.
 - Other sources of funding are not described along with this work if it is approved and are not documented and shared as part of the programmatic approach.

4. Work Plan

Application questions

Provide an overview of your Riparian Program work plan referencing specific investment priority categories (i.e., Reach Scale Planning and Outreach, Native Plant Materials, Landowner Outreach, Riparian Restoration Implementation), related tasks, task leads, timelines, and approach to accomplish the work. A Draft Work Plan template is provided for your use to download from EAGL for this purpose, though the applicant is welcome to provide the information in a different format. If the template, or alternative format is used, place in the Uploads section of EAGL and reference the filename(s) in the space below.

- **High: 11-15 points**
 - The proposal provides a brief, clear overview of the specific investment priority categories, related tasks, task leads, timelines, and approaches to accomplish the work.

- **Medium: 6-10 points**
 - The proposal provides a somewhat clear overview of the investment priority category, and is missing some information about related tasks, task leads, timelines, and approaches to accomplish the work.
- **Low: 1-5 points**
 - The proposal provides an unclear overview of the investment priority category, and is missing a lot of information about meaningful tasks, task leads, timelines, and approaches to accomplish the work.

5. Geographic Focus and Integration with Existing Priorities

Application questions

Provide a series of maps as attachments and reference them in the following response that illustrates and provide context for the geographic areas that will be a focus of the grant and lead to a sustainable and durable riparian management program. Reference Appendix N for resources and guidance about the mapping and data that may be helpful to describe this context. **Provide map attachments in .pdf or .jpeg format with clear titles that can be referenced in the narrative response portion of this question.**

5.a Focus Area, reach-scale, and neighborhood level mapping

Map and describe the Focus Area for your Riparian Implementation Program using the “nested-scale” approach described below, mapping your Focus area broadly at a landscape level, down to a more focused level.

- (Broadest view) Provide a Focus Area Map that includes all of the focus reaches and or small watersheds that you propose for your riparian program. Things to consider in this map are:
 - Jurisdictional boundaries
 - Watershed boundaries
 - Major streams and rivers
- (Medium view) Provide a Focus Reach(es) map(s) of each focus reach or small watershed within your Focus Area with enough detail to illustrate at a minimum:
 - Water Quality Impairment Information
 - Salmon presence
 - Areas of Impervious Surface
 - Major Land Uses (e.g., Agricultural Lands, Urban areas)
 - Significant areas of intact or degraded riparian habitat
 - Other major contextual information that your reach-scale strategy will account for (e.g., areas of existing restoration project efforts, salmon recovery priority areas)
- (Small Scale) Within a given Focus Reach or small watershed, highlight key areas to a multiple “parcel or property level” (e.g., neighborhood) that will be the focus of your reach-scale strategy and where early opportunities may exist. Within these maps, where possible indicate:
 - Landowners that have already been engaged by partners and may be interested in restoration or protection activities. If possible, provide documentation of these (e.g., Landowner Acknowledgement Forms) in your application.
 - Previously restored, in-progress, or proposed restoration project locations
 - Areas of existing riparian area that are in good functional condition
 - Areas of potential riparian areas in need of restoration

5.b. Integration with Existing Strategies to Advance Riparian Management

Describe how the riparian program you propose will integrate with existing strategies and watershed plans (such as Salmon Recovery Plans, Total Maximum Daily Load plans, Ecosystem Recovery Plans, etc.), to build on and

fill gaps to advance riparian objectives in the Focus Area. Describe partners that will be engaged to advance the programmatic strategy in planned focus reaches. Consider the maps provided, and/or bring additional information that establishes the context for this focus area and the strategy that will be established. Where appropriate, reference key tasks that are designed to address this context. At a minimum:

- Describe the water quality context and strategy (referencing key tasks where appropriate) to address key impairments and opportunities.
- Describe the status of salmon recovery efforts in the Focus Area and explain how the proposal fits into and supports those efforts.
- Describe how climate change may affect this focus area specifically, citing studies and projections where possible, particularly related to water quality context and salmon use.
- Describe the land use and landowner context and strategy. Include descriptions of how the benefits of this work might align with existing work or goals of underserved and disadvantaged communities in your focus area.
- Describe any existing reach or watershed scale management/ restoration plan(s) that includes the proposal focus area and describe the status of these efforts. Explain how the plan(s) inform the proposal and how proposed activities fit into and support that plan.
- **High: 20-30 points**
 - The proposal is directly connected to the broader context of riparian management issues and needs and the applicant directly identifies and references linkages between their proposal and past efforts. The proposal justifies the proposed work as the solution.
 - The proposal provides mapping information in a clear and understandable manner that is relatively easy to connect how the proposal is justified and will make a significant contribution to the issues identified.
 - The proposal describes the integration of existing strategies and watershed plans in the focus area and it builds on or fills gaps to advance riparian objectives in the focus area.
 - The partners listed seem to be engaged in the program and willing to advance the programmatic strategy in the planned focus area.
- **Medium 10-19 points**
 - The proposal is somewhat connected to the broader context of riparian management issues and the applicant directly identifies and references linkages between their proposal and past efforts.
 - The proposal somewhat justifies that the proposed work is the solution.
 - The proposal does not use clear and easily understandable mapping information to describe the connection between the proposal and the supporting materials.
 - The partners listed are either not key contributors to a riparian program, or are not engaged in the program, or do not seem ready and willing to engage to advance the programmatic strategy in the planned focus area.
- **Low: 1-9 points**
 - The proposal does not include information on the broader context of riparian management issues and/or does not make linkages between the proposal and past efforts.
 - The proposal meets none of the criteria to use mapping information to cite and justify the rationale for the proposed work within each category.
 - The proposal does not clearly describe the connection between the proposal and the supporting material in a way that is easy to understand.
 - The partners are either not listed or do not seem like they are willing to engage on the proposal.

6. Programmatic Approach to Riparian Management

Application questions #6

Summarize the proposed approach, within the context described in question 5, to establishing and/or expanding upon existing riparian management efforts in your Focus Area to support a programmatic approach to riparian management. Describe the planning basis (i.e., existing or proposed reach-scale plans) for restoration and protection priorities that will guide landowner outreach and recruitment. Highlight the interrelated elements of your proposal as they relate to the Investment Priority categories (i.e., Reach-scale Planning and Outreach, Native Plant Materials etc.) and what is needed to establish and/or accelerate riparian restoration and protection activities in your proposed Focus Area. Provide details on how the proposed activities will lead to a durable program that can continue past the immediate funding available under this funding opportunity.

- **High: 18-25 points**
 - The proposal describes a holistic programmatic approach to work within the Focus Area that is likely to be sustainable beyond the current funding.
 - The proposal clearly describes activities that will likely accelerate riparian restoration and/or protection in the Focus Area given landowner and land use context described.
 - The proposal includes funding for or is based on a reach-scale plan that establish priorities for landowner engagement and implementation activities.
- **Medium: 10-17 points**
 - The proposal provides a vague description of a programmatic approach within the Focus Area that might be sustainable beyond the current funding.
 - The proposal somewhat describes activities that may or may not accelerate riparian restoration and/or protection in the Focus Area given landowner and land use context described.
 - The proposal includes some funding for or is loosely based on a reach-scale plan that establish priorities for landowner engagement and implementation activities.
- **Low: 1-9 points**
 - The proposal does not describe a holistic programmatic approach to work within the Focus Area and is unlikely to be sustainable beyond the current funding.
 - The proposal does not describe activities that will likely accelerate riparian restoration and/or protection in the Focus Area given landowner and land use context described.
 - The proposal does not include funding for or is not based on a reach-scale plan that establish priorities for landowner engagement and implementation activities.

Application questions #6a-#6f

Questions 6a-6f below are specific to each priority listed in the Climate Resilient Riparian Systems Investment Plan. For each priority, answer the associated questions. If your application scope of work does not include elements listed in the investment priority section, leave that section blank or mark the question as “Not Applicable”. Each question answered will be evaluated on a 0-10 scale, where the final score (out of 25 total possible) will be based upon percentage of total possible points where each question (6a-6f) will receive equal weight for this category of criteria.

Example hypothetical scoring for 6a-6f:

6a = 5/10 points possible

6b NA

6c NA

6d = 9/10 points possible

6e = 3/10 points possible

6f = 6/10 points possible

Total score for 6a-6f = 23/40 = 57.5%

Total Evaluation points for 6a-6f = 0.575 * 25 = 14.4

Questions 6a-6f reflect the funding priorities established in the CR2SL Eligible Funding Table in the [Funding Guidelines](#) (Chapter 1). This funding opportunity prioritizes creation or expansion of sustainable, locally supported, programmatic approaches to riparian management in priority areas. Programmatic approaches to riparian management will contain elements of most, if not all the following investment areas. Describe how activities under the following investment priorities will accelerate and advance sustainable approaches to riparian restoration and protection. Where possible, describe and quantify the Measure of Impact of the activities as they relate to the Key Goals, Outcomes and Outputs described in the [2024 Investment Plan](#).¹ Appendix O of the [Funding Guidelines](#) should be considered as well for relevant metrics for each Investment Priority. If only one investment priority is proposed, provide documentation of other activities, programs, or leveraged work that will allow for a programmatic approach to the work.

- **High: 18-25 points**
 - The proposal describes and/or quantifies a significant benefit with lasting outcomes on the riparian management programs in the area.
- **Medium: 10-17 points**
 - The proposal describes and/or quantifies a benefit with some lasting outcomes on the riparian management programs in the area.
- **Low: 1-9 points**
 - The proposal does not describe and/or quantify any benefits with lasting outcomes on the riparian management programs in the area.

7. Programmatic Capability

Application questions

Describe the lead applicant and partners on the application, their expertise and capabilities relative to the Focus Area and Focus Reach(es) context as well as how they are positioned to advance key tasks within the Investment Priorities that will be supported with this proposal.

- **High: 11-15 points**
 - The proposed activities under each of the relevant investment priorities will accelerate and advance sustainable approaches to riparian restoration and/or protection.
 - The lead applicant and partners have the expertise and capabilities necessary to complete the work described in the proposal and workplan. They are the best partners to be working on this proposal for the area/reach.
- **Medium: 6-10 points**
 - The proposed activities under each of the relevant investment priorities might accelerate and might help advance approaches to riparian restoration and/or protection.
 - The lead applicant and partners have some of the expertise and capabilities necessary to complete the work described in the proposal and workplan and may have expertise on the specific focus area or reach. They are good partners to be working on this proposal for the area/reach.
- **Low: 1-5 points**
 - The proposed activities under each of the relevant investment priorities will not likely accelerate or help advance approaches to riparian restoration and/or protection.

¹ <https://apps.ecology.wa.gov/publications/summarypages/2406015.html>

- The lead applicant and partners do not describe their expertise and/or capabilities necessary to complete the work described in the proposal and workplan and may or may not be experienced in the specific focus area and reach. There are likely better partners to be working on this proposal for the area/reach.

8. Community Engagement and Environmental Justice

Application questions

Community Based Organization (CBO) applicants, please describe how the proposal reflects community priorities. Non-CBO applicants, please describe your collaboration and engagement with local CBOs for this proposal and how proposal activities may affect overburdened communities and vulnerable populations. A Community-Based Organization is one that is driven by community residents in all aspects of its existence. By that we mean:

- The majority of the governing body and staff consists of local residents,
- The main operating offices are in the community,
- Priority issue areas are identified and defined by residents,
- Solutions to address priority issues are developed with residents, and
- Program design, implementation, and evaluation components have residents intimately involved in leadership positions.

Consider the following in your response:

For CBO applicants:

- What are the anticipated environmental justice or environmental health impacts (positive and negative) of the proposal on vulnerable or disadvantaged communities. Where negative impacts are possible, describe how the proposed approach will mitigate these.
- Does the proposed Focus Area include communities with high impacts from toxics and have low scores in the WA Health Disparities Map?
- Describe how community input and priorities have informed the proposal.
- Describe potential benefits of the proposal to overburdened communities and vulnerable populations.
- Describe how you will engage the communities who will be affected by this work throughout the life of the project.

For non-CBO applicants:

- What are the anticipated environmental justice or environmental health impacts (positive and negative) of the proposal on vulnerable or disadvantaged communities. Where negative impacts are possible, describe how the proposed approach will mitigate these.
- Does the proposed Focus Area include communities with high impacts from toxics and have low scores in the WA Health Disparities Map?
- Describe the integration of local CBOs or overburdened community engagement within this proposal. Identify specific tasks and areas of the work plan that will include coordination with CBOs and any plan to compensate CBO partners or community participants under this proposal.
- Describe CBO support for the current proposal. Provide detail of the nature of the support and documentation of such in the Letters of Support section (including attachments of these).
- Describe potential benefits of the proposal to specific overburdened communities and vulnerable populations.
- Describe how you will engage the communities who will be affected by this work throughout the life of the project.
- How will you connect with local community forums to share and communicate project goals and outcomes to identify local issues?

- **High: 8-10 points**
 - The application clearly describes how the proposed work considers the impacts on environmental justice, environmental health, and disproportionately impacted communities.
 - The proposed work makes progress towards improving community health and avoid unintended consequences during most phases of the work plan.
- **Medium: 4-7 points**
 - The application somewhat describes how the proposed work considers the impacts on environmental justice, environmental health, and disproportionately impacted communities.
 - The proposed work might make progress towards improving community health and/or avoiding unintended consequences during some phases of the work plan.
- **Low: 1-3 points**
 - The application does not describe how the proposed work considers the impacts on environmental justice, environmental health, and disproportionately impacted communities.
 - It is unlikely that the proposed work will make progress towards improving community health and avoid unintended consequences during most phases of the work plan.

9. Climate Change Resilience and Adaptation (20 points, 10% of score)

Application questions

Describe how the proposal takes action to prepare for, adapt, or increase ecological resilience under current and projected impacts of climate change. Describe the projected and observed ecological impacts of climate change to streams within your proposed focus area. Cite any references used. Organize your response by and include specific references to the activities proposed under the relevant Investment Priority category. Consider the following in your response:

- How do your reach-scale planning and restoration strategies support climate adaptation, mitigation and/or adaptive capacity? You may integrate information on climate change projections and how actions will improve resilience and adaptation.
- Describe cultural experts, technical leads, or other advisory groups for program designs that support resiliency and adaptation to climate change.
- Describe climate-smart practices you use or plan to use to improve riparian management and planting success in the Focus Area.
 - **High: 14-20 points**
 - The proposed work includes effective actions to prepare for and adjust for impacts of climate change through mitigation, adaptation, and adaptive capacity of communities to climate change.
 - The proposal includes specific actions that prepare for and adjust to current and projected impacts of climate change.
 - **Medium: 8-13 points**
 - The proposed work includes some actions that may help prepare for and adjust for impacts of climate change through mitigation, adaptation, and/or adaptive capacity of communities to climate change.
 - The proposal includes some actions that may or may not help prepare for and adjust to current and projected impacts of climate change.
 - **Low: 1-7 points**
 - The proposed work does not include actions to prepare for impacts of climate change through mitigation, adaptation, and adaptive capacity of communities to climate change.

- The proposal does not include actions that prepare for and adjust to current and projected impacts of climate change.

10. Tribal Leadership and/or Engagement

Application questions

Tribal applicants please describe how the proposal reflects Tribal priorities. Non-tribal applicants please describe your collaboration and engagement with local Tribe(s) for this proposal and how proposal activities may affect Tribal treaty rights. Consider the following in your response:

For Tribal applicants:

- Describe how Tribal vision and priorities has informed the proposal.
- Describe potential benefits of the proposal to Tribal communities, including protection /promotion of Tribal Treaty Rights

For non-Tribal applicants:

- Describe the integration of local Tribal governments or Tribally-led organizations within this proposal. Identify specific tasks and areas of the work plan that will include coordination with other Tribal Governments and any plan to compensate Tribal partners under this proposal.
- Describe formal Tribal support for the current proposal. Provide detail of the nature of the support and documentation of such in the Letters of Support section (including attachments of these).
- Describe potential benefits of the proposal to specific Tribal communities, including protection /promotion of Tribal Treaty Rights.
- **High: 8-10 points**
 - The proposed work is led by or meaningfully includes Tribal governments, has support from affected Tribes and the surrounding community, and/or benefit the long-term promotion of Tribal Treaty Rights.
- **Medium: 4-7 points**
 - The proposed work is led by or includes Tribal governments, has support from one affected Tribe or the surrounding community, and does not seem to meaningfully benefit the long-term promotion of Tribal Treaty Rights.
- **Low: 1-3 points**
 - The proposed work is not led by and does not meaningfully include Tribal governments. The proposal has minimal support from affected Tribes and the surrounding community, and/or minimal benefits to Tribal Treaty Rights.

11. Letters of Support

Application questions

Provide letters of support for the proposal from partners or coalition members. Describe the letters in the response space below and include as attachments to the application. At a minimum, include letters from:

- Letter from your own or a supporting Tribal Council/Leadership body or Tribal Natural Resource Department.
- Landowners pre-identified for implementation funding (restoration or protection activities) at the time of the proposal. Consider use of the Landowner Acknowledgement Form, example provided in our Funding Guidelines.
- Community based organizations identified as key partners or advisory groups to be used to inform the planning and outreach activities proposed.

- Tribal or indigenous led organizations identified as supportive, or project partners on the proposal.
- **High: 5 points**
 - The proposal includes letters of support from local community members, key partners, and/or Tribal governments relevant to the proposed focus area.
- **Medium: 3-4 points**
 - The proposal includes some letters of support from local community members, not necessarily key partners, and/or Tribal governments relevant to the proposed focus area.
- **Low: 1-2 points**
 - The proposal does not include letters of support from local community members, key partners, and/or Tribal governments relevant to the proposed focus area.