

Criteria	Low (0-2)	Medium (3)	High (4-5)	Score (0-5)	Weight	Total	
Areas/Actions	<i>Target Area</i>	Project is not located in a first or second tier priority area and does not address a limiting factor.	Project is located in a second tier priority area and addresses a limiting factor.	Project is located in a first tier priority area and addresses at least one limiting factor.		4	0
	<i>Watershed Processes & Habitat Features</i>	Project may address, protect, or restore habitat conditions but does not affect habitat forming processes.	Addresses, protects, or improves habitat conditions and/or partially restores natural habitat forming processes.	Addresses, protects, or restores habitat conditions and/or restores watershed processes that form and sustain natural habitat.		3	0
	<i>Scale</i>	Project addresses a localized action or assessment at a specific site; project addresses a single species of salmonid.	Project addresses an action or assessment that affects a reach or sub-basin scale, and addresses two or more species or populations of salmonids (preferably ESA listed salmonids)	Project addresses an action or assessment that affects more than one sub-basin; and addresses three or more listed populations of salmonids essential for recovery under state and/or federal ESA.		2	0
Benefit (Choose One by Project Type)	<i>Restoration</i>	Project is not identified in the Stillaguamish Recovery Plan and is not consistent with the 3 Year Work Plan.	Project is identified in the Stillaguamish Recovery Plan and is consistent with the 3 Year Work Plan. Project would result in a moderate gain in habitat relative to 10 year targets	Project is identified in the Stillaguamish Recovery Plan and is consistent with the 3 Year Work Plan. Project would result in a large gain relative to 10 year targets.		3	0
	<i>Acquisitions for Protection</i>	Proposed acquisition and/or easement is in proximity (>1/4 mile) of existing preserved land, acquisition and/or easement. Project has <40% habitat intact and restoration is not proposed. Has existing resource protective regulations in place.	Proposed acquisition/easement is in close proximity (<1/4 mile) of existing preserved land, 40 - 60% habitat intact; If <60% must include restoration. If restoration includes more than revegetation and/or control of invasive plants, project should be considered as an Acquisition for Restoration. Some existing resource protective regulations are in place.	Proposed acquisition/easement is immediately adjacent to existing preserved land. Project has >60% habitat intact. Does not have existing resource protective regulations in place.		3	0
	<i>Acquisitions for Restoration</i>	Proposed acquisition does not include a developed future restoration component.	Proposed acquisition has a future restoration component, but it is not fully developed.	Proposed acquisition has a well developed restoration component.		3	0
	<i>Assessments, Design: Planning Projects</i>	Addresses an identified low priority data gap or one that has already been addressed. Will not lead to new, viable projects.	Addresses an identified medium priority data gap. Will lead to new projects in priority areas and is independent of other key conditions being addressed first.	Addresses an identified high priority data gap. Crucial to understanding processes, relevant to project development or sequencing, will clearly lead to new projects in high priority areas.		3	0
Scope & Methods & Sequence	<i>Scope</i>	Scope of project is not well matched to project goals or target area objectives.	Scope is appropriate to meet some or many of the project goals and relevant target area objectives.	Scope is appropriate to meet clearly articulated project goals and relevant target area objectives.		1	0
	<i>Approach/Scientific Methodology</i>	Uses untested and unproven scientific methods. Unclear or lacks scientific information about the problem being addressed.	Uses proven scientific methods that may have been tested but the results are incomplete. Methods have been identified through a documented habitat assessment or scientific opinion.	Consistent with proven scientific methods or substantial scientific justification and support for new methods. Identified through a documented habitat assessment and supported by peer reviewed scientific literature.		1	0
	<i>Sequence</i>	May be in the wrong sequence with other protection and restoration actions.	Dependent on other actions being taken first that are outside the scope of this project.	Correct phase of a phased project. Is in the correct sequence and is independent of other actions.		1	0
Certainty (Choose One by Project Type)	<i>Acquisition for Protection; Long-term Protection & Stewardship</i>	Provides little to no evidence of certainty regarding long-term protection under existing regulations. Plan or funding for stewardship of the area is not identified	Provides some evidence of certainty regarding long-term protection under existing regulations. Clearly identifies plans but does not fund stewardship of the area for >10 years	Provides evidence of certainty regarding long-term protection under existing regulations. Clearly identifies a plan and funds stewardship of the area for >10 years.		2	0
	<i>Acquisitions for Restoration; Long term implementation</i>	Restoration plan not developed. Restoration time frame unknown. It is unknown whether there are existing constraints/obstacles including infrastructure, for the restoration project and a feasibility study has not been done.	Restoration plan partially developed. The restoration plan has identified constraints/obstacles including infrastructure and a complete feasibility study has not been done. Plan identifies restoration implementation within 3-5 years of acquisition.	Restoration plan fully developed. The restoration plan identified and addressed constraints/obstacles including infrastructure and a feasibility study was completed. Plan identifies restoration implementation within 1-2 years of acquisition.		2	0
	<i>Restoration; Long-term Protection and Maintenance</i>	Uncertain or limited design life of habitat benefit; uncertainties not acknowledged or addressed; no adaptive management, maintenance or contingencies proposed.	Project may require some maintenance; habitat benefit on the order of decades; uncertainties acknowledged; includes contingency for adaptive management or maintenance of site.	Project has high likelihood of being self-sustaining; long term habitat benefit; uncertainties are well described; contingency for adaptive management or maintenance of site included as appropriate.		2	0
	<i>Assessments, Design: Planning Projects; Long term outcome</i>	Future projects have not been identified.	Future projects have been identified and will be implemented within 3-5 years of completed assessment.	Future projects have been identified and will be implemented within 1-2 years of completed assessment.		2	0
Certainty cont'd	<i>Landowner(s)</i>	Surrounding landowners and other affected parties have not been contacted, effects of project on neighbors have not been considered or addressed. Landowner willingness and/or ability to sell is unknown.	Some surrounding landowners and affected parties have been contacted, some effects of project on neighbors has been considered and addressed. Landowner(s) will likely allow project/assessment work to be done and is willing to sell if acquisition.	All surrounding landowners and affected parties have been contacted, all reasonable effects on surrounding neighbors have been considered and addressed. Landowner(s) are willing to allow project and/or assessment work to be done and is willing to sell (if acquisition).		1	0
	<i>Applicant Experience</i>	Applicant has not successfully completed a project.	Applicant has successfully completed one project.	Applicant has successfully completed one or more projects.		1	0
Costs	<i>Cost Effectiveness</i>	Has a high or unreasonable costs relative to project's scope and location.	Has reasonable and appropriate costs relative to the project's scope and location.	Has a low cost relative to the project's scope and location.		1	0
TOTAL SCORE						0	