

Appendix J:

Targeted Investments Program

The Targeted Investments program allows the SRFB to invest funding in specific regional priorities to accelerate salmon recovery. In 2024, the SRFB solicited projects for the Targeted Investments program. The SRFB will not solicit projects for the Targeted Investment program in 2025.

Investment Priorities

It is the intent of the SRFB to use targeted investments to allocate different types of state and federal funding not dedicated to the regional allocation to support high-impact projects with significant salmon recovery benefits.

Specifically, the SRFB intends to target investments for projects that (1) drive significant population-scale benefits consistent with regional recovery priorities and (2) accelerate the on-the-ground pace and scale of project implementation.

Project Eligibility

In addition to the eligibility requirements found in “Section 2: Eligible Projects,” each Targeted Investment project must satisfy all the following eligibility criteria:

- Address both SRFB targeted investment funding priorities above
- Restore and/or acquire habitat, which may include design funding
- Request more than \$1 million from SRFB, except as otherwise specified in a particular grant round
- Be supported by the lead entity where the project is located
- Not be fully funded by the current regional allocation or sub-allocation to lead entities

- Have a letter of support from the regional recovery organization where the project is located detailing the project's alignment with specific population-level recovery objectives and/or limiting factors prioritized for this funding by the regional recovery organization.

The SRFB may include additional eligibility requirements as part of opening a Targeted Investment grant round if needed to support the intent of the program.

Match

The SRFB waives the match requirement for Targeted Investment projects, unless otherwise required as part of a specific Targeted Investment grant round.

Application Information

Allocation and Funding

The SRFB may fund Targeted Investments only if funding remains after allocating annual statewide funding of \$18 million from state capital budget appropriations and the Pacific Coastal Salmon Recovery Fund. A Targeted Investment grant round is initiated through the release of allocation and funding guidance to regional recovery organizations, which shall include, at a minimum, the following information:

- Secured, requested, or pending funding that will be allocated to the Targeted Investment grant round
- Limits, if any, on the size of individual grant requests, as well as the number of projects and/or total grant requests that can come from a specific region. These limits must be the same across regions
- Supplementary eligibility criteria and ranking criteria as needed

The SRFB may actively use the Targeted Investments process to access and leverage new state and non-state funding as opportunities arise.

Regional Project Support

Regional recovery organizations are responsible for all the following:

- Working with lead entities, project sponsors, and other partners to identify specific population-level recovery objectives and/or limiting factors prioritized for Targeted Investments funding.
- Recruiting proposed project(s) to apply for Targeted Investments funding in accordance with the guidelines and limitations included in this policy and associated with the Targeted Investments grant round.

Before final submission of a Targeted Investments application, regional recovery organizations must provide a letter of support with the application materials detailing the project's alignment with specific population-level recovery objectives and/or limiting factors prioritized for this funding by the regional recovery organization.

Submission

Applications for eligible projects typically will be accepted in conjunction with a regular SRFB grant round; however, the SRFB may elect to use alternate timelines as needed to support the intent of the Targeted Investments program.

An applicant must work with the lead entity coordinator for the area where the project is located to enter project information into the Salmon Recovery Portal and create an application in PRISM. The applicant must follow the application schedule, initial review timeline, and requirements for the grant round outlined in this manual and by the lead entity.

The applicant also must satisfy additional requirements described in this appendix and found in the application questions in PRISM. The applicant will follow steps 1 through 4 established in "Section 3: How to Apply." The applicant also will follow "Section 4: SRFB Evaluation Process" in this manual, including the review of projects by the SRFB Review Panel for technical merit.

An application may have additional review as determined by the regional recovery organization. Targeted Investments must be endorsed by the lead entity but are not part of the annual lead entity ranking process. However, partial funding for a targeted investments project may be received through a lead entity ranked list.

Technical Review

RCO grants managers will review the application to ensure it is complete and the project meets the minimum eligibility criteria. The applicant must ensure application materials are submitted at least two weeks before SRFB Review Panel site visit.

After the site visit, the SRFB Review Panel will indicate whether a project is "Clear," "Conditioned," "Needs More Information," or a "Project of Concern." A project with statuses of "Needs More Information" or "Project of Concern" will be returned to the applicant to answer questions and comments and resubmit as a final application.

The project then will be re-reviewed. The SRFB Review Panel will indicate whether the project is cleared or conditioned for funding or whether it remains a "Project of Concern" and is not recommended for funding. See sections 3 and 4 for more details on the technical review.

Scoring

The SRFB Review Panel will score all final applications using the evaluation criteria below, as well as any additional criteria included as part of the specific targeted investment grant round. The SRFB Review Panel will include a written evaluation with findings to support the scoring presented to the SRFB. A project that remains a "Project of Concern" will not be scored or recommended for funding.

Funding Awards

The SRFB has the authority to fund Targeted Investments. The SRFB will determine which projects to fund by considering the following:

- Eligibility and evaluation criteria
- The review panel's technical evaluation and recommendations
- The degree to which a project addresses SRFB Targeted Investments funding priorities
- The extent to which a project leverages resources and partnerships and/or compliments broader recovery efforts
- The extent to which the project demonstrates meaningful engagement with underserved communities
- The extent to which the project will be resilient to climate change

To take advantage of funding secured after the opening of a grant round, the SRFB may elect to fund Targeted Investments projects in multiple phases or roll unfunded projects into future grant rounds.

Award Administration

Once approved for funding by the SRFB, Targeted Investments awards will be administered through contracts between project sponsors and RCO. Sponsors must follow the amendment process outlined in section 6 and appendix I.

Evaluation Criteria

Investment Priorities

1. Limiting Factors: Projects that drive significant population-level benefits to address priority limiting factors identified in regional recovery plans will receive higher scores. Specifically, the highest scoring projects will do the following:

- Clearly address priority limiting factor(s) specifically identified in regional recovery plans.
- Be in a high-priority geographic area that maximizes project impact at the population level for target species or life stages.
- Target priority habitat features or types known to limit productivity for the target species and/or life stage.
- Be identified as a priority through a documented habitat assessment, inventory, or other study.

▲ Point Range: 0-5 points

5 points	Uses recent inventories or assessments to target a specific geographic area or habitat feature that limits productivity for multiple species and life stages.
4-5 points	Targets a geographic area or habitat feature known to limit productivity. May not be highest priority location or habitat type or may not be informed by inventories or assessments.
2-3 points	Moderately addresses a priority limiting factor but may not have population-level impacts and is not informed by recent inventories or assessments.
0-1 point	Tangentially addresses a priority limiting factor at some level but does not target a priority location or habitat type and/or does not consider known information and research.

2. Funding Impact: Projects that can demonstrate how Targeted Investments funding will increase the on-the-ground scale, reduce phases, and/or increase efficiencies will receive the highest score. Specifically, the highest scoring projects will demonstrate how funding will do the following:

- Significantly increase the scale of the project in terms of miles of habitat accessed, acres protected, or acres restored

- Significantly reduce the timeline necessary for full implementation of a larger, multi-phase project
- Support critical financial or capacity efficiencies
- Take advantage of time-sensitive opportunities to increase project cost-benefit

▲ Point Range: 0-5 points

5 points	Clearly demonstrated that Targeted Investments funding will play a key role in increasing project pace and scale, would support unique efficiencies and/or time-sensitive opportunities to implement innovative approaches, and that the project might not happen without this specific source of funding.
3-4 points	Demonstrated that Targeted Investments funding will help increase pace and/or scale of the project relative to the regional allocation, but not clear that funding is uniquely important because of timing or specific nature of the project.
1-2 points	Limited indication of funding impact, possibly because project needs significant additional unsecured funds or previously has received multiple grants from other sources for similar types of work.
0 points	Application does not provide information that addresses the role of funding in supporting increased pace and scale, efficiencies, or unique opportunities.

3. Scale of Benefit: Projects with significant, positive impacts on multiple measurable restoration metrics and/or species benchmarks will receive the highest score, including but not limited to metrics such as the following:

- Salmon habitat gain in miles
- Salmon habitat improved or protected in acres
- Improvements in life-stage specific survival rates
- Improvements in viability for focal populations
- Improvements in fish passage percentage

▲ Point Range: 0-6 points

- | | |
|------------|---|
| 6 points | Large, positive impact on miles accessed or acres improved/protected, along with major potential impact on both life-stage survival rates and population viability for multiple target populations. |
| 4-5 points | Moderate habitat gain in miles accessed or acres improved/protected and moderate direct impact on improvements to salmonid survival rates, passage success, population viability, etc. |
| 2-3 points | Moderate habitat gain in miles accessed or acres improved/protected, or moderate direct impact on improvements to salmonid survival rates, passage success, population viability, etc. |
| 0-1 points | Very limited habitat gains in miles accessed or acres improved/protected, or no apparent direct impact on improvements to salmonid survival rates, passage success, etc. |

4. Ecological Processes: Self-sustaining, resilient projects that recover habitat through process-based solutions will receive the highest scores. Specifically, the highest scoring projects will be characterized by the following:

- Surrounding conditions that support the project
- A site that is resilient to future degradation
- Will restore or protect self-sustaining processes on the site, with naturally increasing benefit
- Project is designed to be resilient to changes in sea level, flows, and species ranges due to climate change.
- Avoids temporary fixes or new hardened infrastructure solutions where possible

▲ Point Range: 0-6 points

- | | |
|------------|--|
| 6 points | The project is wholly process-based on a site resilient to degradation that is supported by surrounding conditions, with naturally increasing benefit involving limited temporary fixes, and that fully incorporates climate change into design. |
| 4-5 points | The project mostly is process-based, on a site resilient to degradation that is supported by surrounding conditions, with |

limited temporary fixes, and that considers climate change in project design. May involve some hardened infrastructure that couldn't be avoided to achieve desired benefit.

2-3 points The project is somewhat process-based and may have surrounding conditions or approaches that limit the resilience or self-sustaining potential of the project or proposes some new hardened infrastructure solutions that could have been avoided.

0-1 point The project has no discernable process-based approaches and is focused primarily on temporary fixes involving installation of new hardened infrastructure solutions that could have been avoided.

5. Species: Proposal addressing multiple life history stages for multiple listed salmonid species/populations will receive the highest score as follows:

▲ Point Range: 0-3 points

3 points Multiple life stages of multiple listed salmonid species/populations

2 points Multiple life stages of a single listed salmonid species/populations or single life stage of multiple listed salmonid species/populations

1 point Single life stage of a single listed salmonid species/population

0 points Does not address a listed salmonid species/population

6. Scope, Goals, Objectives: Correctly sequenced projects with an appropriate scope and supporting goals and objectives will receive the highest score. Specifically, the highest scoring projects will do the following:

- Address root cause of problem identified
- Have objectives that support and refine biological goals
- Have objectives that are specific quantifiable actions to achieve stated goal
- Project is in the correct sequence and is independent of other actions being taken first

▲ Point Range: 0-5 points

5 points The project clearly addresses the root cause of the identified problem; the project is sequenced correctly and independent of other needed action; goals and objectives support and refine biological goals and complement the project scope.

3-4 points	Appears to address root cause of problem and be in sequence, but goals and objectives are not entirely clear or quantified, and/or may not all be achievable with implementation of the project.
1-2 points	The extent to which the root cause of the problem is being addressed is unclear, objectives may be unquantified and don't support biological goals, and/or project is dependent on other actions that may influence timely completion of the full scope.
0 points	Project clearly does not address root causes of identified problems, has no identified problem that is to be solved, and creates major outstanding questions of whether the scope can be achieved.

7. Readiness to Proceed: Proposals that demonstrate readiness to proceed will receive the highest score. Specifically, the highest scoring projects will do the following:

- Have an appropriate and achievable time frame
- Have completed all design requirements
- Have made significant progress in permitting
- Have established cultural resources compliance

▲ Point Range: 0-5 points

4-5 points	Project has near final designs, with permits and cultural resource compliance completed, and/or technical specifications and bid documents in hand.
2-3 points	Project has completed preliminary design requirements and has made significant progress on additional design elements, cultural resources compliance, and/or permit review.
0-1 points	Project has completed preliminary design requirements but there are significant outstanding issues related to sequencing, permitting, and/or cultural resources compliance.

- 8. Sponsor Experience:** Experience with restoration and/or acquisition projects reflects a higher likelihood of future success. A sponsor who has successfully implemented similar salmon restoration projects will receive the highest score.

▲ Point Range: 0-5 points

5 points	Project sponsor has extensive project implementation experience and successfully has implemented many projects similar in scope and scale to the one proposed.
3-4 points	Project sponsor has moderate project implementation experience and/or has successfully implemented some projects similar in scope and scale to the one proposed.
1-2 points	Project sponsor has limited experience with project implementation and/or limited experience with the type of project proposed.
0 points	Project sponsor has no previous experience with salmon recovery project implementation.

- 9. Cost Benefit:** Tied projects that maximize the benefits of limited public funding will receive the higher ranking. Specifically, the higher-ranking projects will do the following:

- Leverage significant additional funds
- Have a clear, detailed budget and well-justified costs
- Have a low-cost relative to the predicted benefits for the project type

▲ Point Range: None