

Appendix F:

SRFB Evaluation Criteria

To help ensure that every project funded by the SRFB is technically sound, the SRFB Review Panel will note for the SRFB any projects it believes have the following:

- Low benefit to salmon
- A low likelihood of being successful
- Costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits of the project

Projects designated as “Projects of Concern” have a low benefit to salmon, a low likelihood of success, or costs that outweigh the anticipated benefits. The SRFB Review Panel will not otherwise rate, score, or rank projects, unless directed by the SRFB. RCO expects that projects will follow best management practices and will meet local, state, and federal permitting requirements.

The SRFB Review Panel uses the review module in PRISM Online to capture comments on individual projects. Comments, once shared by a panel, are visible on each project application in PRISM on the *Review Comments* screen.

Criteria

For all projects, the panel will determine that a project is not technically sound and cannot be significantly improved if it meets one or more of the following criteria:

- It is unclear there is a problem to salmonids the project is addressing. For an acquisition project, this criterion relates to the lack of a clear threat if the property is not acquired.
- Information provided or current understanding of the system is not sufficient to determine the need for, or the benefit of, the project.
 - Incomplete application or proposal.

- Project's goal or objectives not clearly stated or do not address salmon habitat protection or restoration.
 - Project sponsor did not respond to SRFB Review Panel comments.
 - Acquisition parcel prioritization (for multisite proposals) is not provided or the prioritization does not meet the project's goal or objectives.
- The project is dependent on addressing other key conditions or processes first.
- The project has a high cost relative to the anticipated benefits and the project sponsor failed to justify the costs to the satisfaction of the SRFB Review Panel.
- The project does not account for the conditions or processes in the watershed.
- The project may be in the wrong sequence with other habitat protection, assessments, or restoration actions in the watershed.
- The project does not work towards restoring natural watershed processes or prohibits natural processes.
- It is unclear how the project will achieve its stated goals or objectives.
- It is unlikely that the project will achieve its stated goals or objectives.
- There is low potential for threat to habitat conditions if the project is not completed.
- The project is sited improperly.
- The submitted project design deliverables are inadequate relative to the total overall project cost, design complexity, applicant technical experience, or risk factors.
- The stewardship description is insufficient or there is inadequate commitment to stewardship and maintenance and this likely would jeopardize the project's success.
- The focus is on supplying a secondary need, such as education, streambank stabilization to protect property, or water supply.

Additional Criteria for Riparian Restoration Projects

In addition to the criteria above, for a riparian planting project, if the project does not meet the required minimum buffer width, the SRFB Review Panel will evaluate the project based on the site-specific conditions and determine whether the proposed width can provide riparian function, will provide a benefit to salmon recovery, and will achieve goals as articulated in the regional recovery plans.

Additional Criteria for Planning Projects

For a planning project (e.g., assessment, design, inventory, and study), the SRFB Review Panel will consider the criteria listed above and the additional criteria below. The SRFB Review Panel will determine that a project is not technically sound and cannot improve significantly if the following conditions are met:

- 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.
- The methods do not appear to be appropriate to meet the goals and objectives of the project.
- There are significant constraints to the implementation of projects following completion of the planning project.
- The project does not clearly lead to project design or does not meet the criteria for filling a data gap.
- The project does not appear to be coordinated with other efforts in the watershed or does not use appropriate methods and protocols.