

Table 13. TAC scoring questions for Benefits to Fish. Minimum thresholds for each scoring levels (High, Medium, and Low) are included for each question. Information that can support scores within each level are included in italics. Resources to support these questions and score levels are described in the Policy Manual Guiding Principles table and Appendix C Evaluation Criteria, with potential data sources found in Table 8. Low scores indicate a fatal flaw, which may mean a project does not qualify for funding.

Benefits to Fish Scoring Questions and Guidelines			Points
High Priority Populations	1. Does the proposal target high priority populations for species-scale recovery?		0 – 50
	High Score:	Proposal should target at least one Primary population. <i>More points may be awarded to proposals that target: multiple Primary populations and/or historical core and/or genetic legacy populations; Contributing and Stabilizing populations in addition to one or more Primary populations; populations in steelhead genes bank or wild salmonid management zone areas; and/or, WDFW chum priority populations (Guiding Principles 1, 10).</i>	34 - 50
	Medium Score:	Proposal should target at least one Contributing population. <i>More points may be awarded to proposals that target: multiple Contributing populations and/or historical core and/or genetic legacy populations; Stabilizing populations in addition to one or more Contributing populations; populations in steelhead gene banks or wild salmonid management zone areas; and/or, WDFW chum priority populations (Guiding Principles 1, 10).</i>	17 - 33
	Low Score:	Proposal does not target any Primary or Contributing populations. <i>More points may be awarded to proposals that target: multiple Stabilizing populations in need of maintenance support: populations in wild salmonid management zone areas: and/or, WDFW chum priority populations (Guiding Principles 1, 10).</i>	0 - 16
	2. Does the proposal target populations that likely require project-based habitat improvements (habitat restoration, connection, and/or protection) to achieve species-scale recovery?		0 - 50
	High Score:	Proposal targets one or more populations that likely require project-based habitat improvements to achieve recovery targets.	34 - 50
	Medium Score:	Proposal only targets populations that likely require project-based habitat maintenance to achieve recovery targets.	17 - 33
Low Score:	Proposal only targets populations that likely do not require project-based habitat improvements or maintenance to achieve recovery targets.	0 - 16	
High Priority Population Points: 100			
High Priority Habitat	3. Does the proposal target high priority habitat areas and limited life stages to maximize restoration/ protection benefits to the targeted populations?		0 - 50
	High Score:	Proposal addresses habitat limiting factors for life stage bottlenecks of targeted populations.	34 - 50
	Medium Score:	Proposal addresses habitat limiting factors, but not for life stage bottlenecks of targeted populations.	17 - 33
	Low Score:	Proposal does not address habitat limiting factors for any life stages of targeted populations.	0 - 16
	4. Does the proposed approach support the highest priority salmon habitat needs for both short and long-term recovery by working with watershed processes and considering climate change impacts?		0 – 50
	High Score:	Proposal targets the root stressors of high priority salmon habitat needs and watershed processes, and considers long-term impacts of climate change.	34 - 50
	Medium Score:	Proposal targets symptoms that limit high priority salmon habitat and are compatible with watershed processes, and/or does not consider long-term impacts of climate change.	17 - 33
Low Score:	Proposal targets symptoms in a way that is incompatible with watershed processes, and does not consider long-term impacts of climate change.	0 - 16	
High Priority Habitat Points: 100			
Total Benefits to Fish Points Available: 200			

Table 14. TAC scoring questions for Certainty of Success. Minimum thresholds for each scoring levels (High, Medium, and Low) are included for each question. Low scores indicate a fatal flaw, which may mean a project does not qualify for funding.

Certainty of Success Scoring Questions and Guidelines			Points
Scope and Approach	5. Does the proposal have a well-defined scope and scale consistent with and appropriate for the stated goals and objectives?		0 – 50
	High Score:	proposal is highly likely to achieve the stated goals and objectives	34 - 50
	Medium Score:	proposal is somewhat likely to achieve the stated goals and objectives	17 - 33
	Low Score:	proposal is unlikely to achieve the stated goals and objectives	0 - 16
	6. Does the proposal apply appropriate and proven methods and technologies, including the use of acquisition, or addressing recovery information gaps?		0 - 50
	High Score:	Proposal uses appropriate and proven methods and technologies to achieve the desired outcomes	34 - 50
	Medium Score:	Proposal uses moderately appropriate and/or proven methods and technologies to achieve the desired outcomes	17 - 33
Low Score:	proposal uses inappropriate and/or unproven methods and technologies to achieve the desired outcomes	0 - 16	
Scope and Approach: 100			
Coordination, Sequence, Constraints, and Uncertainties	7. Is the proposal logically sequenced with other salmon recovery efforts in the watershed, including past habitat projects and actions across the H's?		0 – 25
	High Score:	Proposal is well sequenced with other recovery efforts in the watershed.	17 – 25
	Medium Score:	Proposal is moderately well sequenced with other recovery efforts in the watershed.	8 – 16
	Low Score:	Proposal is not sequenced well with other recovery efforts in the watershed.	0 – 7
	8. What is the potential for funding, scientific/technical, permitting, legal, and/or physical constraints or uncertainties to affect successful project implementation?		0 – 25
	High Score:	There is low potential for the described constraints or uncertainties that would affect project implementation success	17 – 25
	Medium Score:	There is moderate potential for the described constraints or uncertainties that would affect project implementation success	8 - 16
Low Score:	There is high potential for the described constraints or uncertainties that would affect project implementation success	0 – 7	
Coordination, Sequence, Constraints, and Uncertainties: 50			
Qualifications, Community Support, and Stewardship	9. How qualified and experienced is the project team in successfully completing projects of similar scope, nature, and magnitude on time and within budget?		0 – 25
	High Score:	The project team is well qualified in completing projects of similar scope, nature, and magnitude on time and within budget	17 – 25
	Medium Score:	The project team is moderately qualified in completing projects of similar scope, nature, and magnitude on time and within budget	8 – 16
	Low Score:	The project team is not well qualified in completing projects of similar scope, nature, and magnitude on time and within budget	0 – 7
	10. What is the demonstrated extent of community support for and involvement in the proposal? For instance, will local volunteers participate, will the project enhance public knowledge and support, and will the project build capacity and interest for future work?		0 – 25
	High Score:	There is extensive community support and involvement in the project	17 – 25
	Medium Score:	There is moderate community support and involvement in the project	8 – 16
Low Score:	There is broad community opposition to the project	0 – 7	
Qualifications, Community Support, and Stewardship: 50			
Total Certainty of Success Points Available: 200			

Table 15. TAC scoring questions for Cost. Minimum thresholds for each scoring levels (High, Medium, and Low) are included for each question. Low scores indicate a fatal flaw, which may mean a project does not qualify for funding.

Cost Scoring Questions and Guidelines			Points
Cost	11. Are the requested amount and total project cost reasonable relative to the likely salmon recovery benefits?		0 – 25
	High Score:	The requested amount and total project cost are highly reasonable relative to the likely salmon recovery benefits	17 – 25
	Medium Score:	The requested amount and total project cost are moderately reasonable relative to the likely salmon recovery benefits	8 – 16
	Low Score:	The requested amount and total project cost are not reasonable relative to the likely salmon recovery benefits	0 – 7
	12. Is the total project cost (grant request and match) reasonable relative to the amount and type of work proposed?		0 – 25
	High Score:	The total project cost is highly reasonable relative to the amount and type of work proposed	17 – 25
	Medium Score:	The total project cost is moderately reasonable relative to the amount and type of work proposed	8 – 16
	Low Score:	The total project cost is not reasonable relative to the amount and type of work proposed	0 – 7
	13. Are costs well described and justified?		0 – 25
	High Score:	Costs are well described and justified.	17 – 25
	Medium Score:	Costs are moderately well described and justified.	8 – 16
	Low Score:	Costs are not well described and/or justified.	0 – 7
	14. Are there more appropriate funding sources available for the proposed work?		0 – 25
	High Score:	This grant program is the most appropriate funding source for the proposed work	17 – 25
Medium Score:	This grant program is an appropriate funding source for the proposed work, but other programs may also support the work	8 – 16	
Low Score:	This grant program is not an appropriate funding source for the proposed work	0 – 7	
Total Cost Points Available: 100			

Award Information

SRFB awards are administered and contracted through the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office. Please review SRFB Manual 18 and discuss any award concerns with the RCO grant manager assigned to the Lead Entity.