



Contents

Program Information	1	Application Review	5
Contact Information	1	Application Deadline	5
Program Objectives.....	1	Submittal Address.....	5
Process-based Restoration	2	Evaluation Objectives	6
Adaptive Management Objectives.....	2	Evaluation Criteria	6
Program Guidance	3	Review Process	6
Award Information.....	3	Summary of Review Schedule.....	7
Anticipated Funding Sources.....	3	Award Administration.....	7
Project Award Period.....	3	Award notices	7
Phased Portfolio Funding.....	4	Contract information.....	7
Waiver of Retroactivity.....	4	Application Content Guidelines.....	8
Eligibility Information.....	4	Application Format	8
Nearshore Database Records	4	Project Data Sheets	8
Eligible Applicants.....	4	Project Narrative	8
Eligible Project Activities	4	Budget Narrative.....	8
Matching Requirements	5	Additional Supporting Documents	9
		Resources	9

Program Information

Contact Information

Questions regarding this RFP should be directed towards Jenna Norman, 360-902-2658, ESRP@dfw.wa.gov, or Paul Cereghino 360-902-2603, ceregprc@dfw.wa.gov.

Program Objectives

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, The NOAA Community-based Nearshore Restoration Fund and the Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership are seeking exemplary projects of regional importance that restore nearshore ecosystem processes and functions. Ecosystem protection actions are ranked competitively alongside restoration actions based on assessment of completed project costs and benefits. Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP) projects should exemplify best practices and reflect the highest use of conservation dollars in the nearshore ecosystem.

Actions will be selected and funded consistent with the strategies and guidance of the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP). Criteria used to rank projects are found in Appendix E, of [ESRP Guidance](#) as well as in the attached narrative template. ESRP funded projects are managed as ‘early action’ projects in advance of a national ecosystem restoration plan for Puget Sound. ESRP ‘early action’ projects either, 1) provide substantial and cost effective restoration or protection of ecosystem functions, goods, and services, or 2) allow evaluation of cutting-edge ecosystem restoration tactics and strategies for the purpose of increasing efficiency and effectiveness of future activity.

ESRP project proposals and the associated PRISM Nearshore Database, will be used as a source of project data to help identify large-scale restoration treatments that can be advanced through an anticipated 2010 Water Resources Development Act, as the first phase of a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Puget Sound ecosystem restoration authority. PSNERP anticipates this first wave of treatments may include 10-15 restoration sites with a cost of \$3-15M per site. These large-scale restoration sites will include both projects with substantial known benefit as well as experimental treatments to clarify future restoration analyses. While the purpose of this RFP is to identify ESRP funding actions for 2009, we hope that notification of the longer-term objectives of the WDFW-USACE General Investigation will inform local project development discussions.

Process-based Restoration

The nearshore ecosystem of Puget Sound is a dynamic environment shaped by physical and biological processes. PSNERP guidance suggests that projects designed to protect and restore ecosystem processes that shape and sustain nearshore structure are most likely to provide sustained improvements in ecosystem functions, goods, and services, thereby justifying capital investment in 'ecosystem infrastructure' that supports these processes. Examples of nearshore ecosystem processes include river delta floodwater and sediment distribution, tidal inundation, beach sediment supply and transport, primary production, and nutrient cycling.

Adaptive Management Objectives

ESRP recognizes that field implementation offers an unparalleled opportunity to evaluate tactics and strategies. ESRP manages its project portfolio under an adaptive management model. The following questions have been identified as having an impact on restoration practice, and could be answered through ESRP project enhancements and coordination. They reflect current priorities of the ESRP program as it looks for opportunities to fill restoration and protection knowledge gaps:

1. **How do bulkheads affect beach structure and biota?** We would like to be able to predict effect of bulkhead presence, location and configuration on sediment structure and transport dynamics and benthic fauna for the purpose of prioritizing bulkhead removal and evaluating benefits.
2. **What are the ecosystem process benefits from 'soft armoring'?** We would like to be able to predict the scope and magnitude of change from replacing bulkhead with 'soft armoring' as a management measure for the purpose of evaluating the importance of 'soft armoring' from the perspective of ecosystem restoration.
3. **What are the cumulative benefits of multiple treatments within a system?** We would like to be able to predict how very large scale actions or combinations of actions result in detectable 'cumulative ecosystem effects' at a landscape scale for the purpose of identifying cumulative project objectives.
4. **How does complete dike removal increase restoration benefits?** We would like to be able to predict the affects of remnant dike configuration on hydrology, biota, and sediment deposition in relation to different alluvial and tidal regimes for the purpose of designing dike removal actions.
5. **How should we be preparing sites for dike removal?** We would like to be able to predict the effect of earthwork treatments like tillage, channel excavation, and ditch filling on vegetation development and channel formation following dike removal for the purpose of determining optimal restoration treatments.
6. **How does tidal marsh channel character contribute to estuarine function?** We would like to be able to predict the effect of tidal channel characteristics on biotic community response for the purpose of evaluating actions that effect channel formation outcomes.
7. **How should we evaluate actions that change the distribution of river distributaries across a delta?** We would like to be able to predict how the characteristics and configuration of river delta distributaries affect biota for the purpose of prioritizing distributary reconnection in river delta restoration.
8. **What vegetation will develop following restoration of tidal inundation, and how does this effect ecosystem functions?** We would like to be able to predict tidal marsh vegetation development and associated functions based on controlling factors to predict the value of actions designed to affect intertidal revegetation.

9. **How can we maximize the benefits of creating new intertidal area by fill removal?** We would like to predict the physical and biological characteristics of intertidal surfaces following removal of fill under variable treatments as compared to natural marshes, to determine the importance of sediment restoration following fill removal.
10. **How can we identify and communicate with landowners that are willing to contribute to habitat protection?** We would like to be able to predict the location of willing landowners for variable ecosystem protection tactics and the most effective approaches to eliciting cooperation for the purpose of targeting private land owner involvement in restoration and protection.
11. **At what scales does shoreline reforestation result in substantial ecosystem benefits?** We would like to predict the effects of nearshore riparian vegetation patch size, continuity and configuration on ecosystem functions, goods and services for the purpose of planning vegetation protection and restoration efforts.

Program Guidance

Additional program information can be found at the Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program web page (<http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/esrp.htm>). An edition of the ESRP Strategy and Guidance document (hereafter referred to as '[ESRP Guidance](#)') has been published and posted in association with this RFP. This document provides details related to the development of the 2009 Spending Plan development, including:

- A description of the ESRP stewardship and learning strategy (Appendix A),
- A definition of what constitutes a 'project' for purposes of ESRP review and contracting (Appendix C),
- A description of project status categories and associated evidence of readiness (Appendix D),
- The evaluation criteria that will be used to rank your project (Appendix E),
- Samples of contracting documents, including an ESRP scope of work template (Appendix J),
- A draft working definition of PSNERP Management Measures (Appendix K), and
- A summary of the PSNERP shoreline classification (Appendix L).

Award Information

Anticipated Funding Sources

This RFP will be used to develop the 2009 ESRP Spending Plan. This spending plan will distribute funds from 2009/11 state appropriations and agreements, as well as FFY 2009 NOAA resources as part of the NOAA Nearshore Restoration Fund.

ESRP anticipates up to \$25 million may be available for distribution to project sponsors between federal and state funding sources. There is no maximum or minimum funding amount for proposed projects. Final award amount and scope may differ from proposed, and will reflect a thorough evaluation of spending plan alternatives, and a project sponsors readiness to complete work in the award period. ESRP Spending Plans reflect an attempt to maximize the amount of project activity on high-priority projects within an award period.

Project Award Period

Project awards will target work to be completed between July 1, 2009 and December 31, 2011.

Phased Portfolio Funding

Our funding strategy of requesting scheduled deliverables for known costs frequently leads to partial and phased funding of projects. Feasibility assessment is often required to define project costs and benefits and provide accurate design estimates. Design analyses are often necessary to provide accurate implementation and evaluation cost estimates.

Project work need not result in construction under a single award. To support phased funding, ESRP has developed a streamlined application process that allows for projects that: 1) have completed feasibility tasks AND have won an award through a regional ESRP competition, and 2) have not substantively altered project scope, to apply for supplemental funds without preparing a full competitive application.

Waiver of Retroactivity

ESRP has adopted the Washington State Restoration and Conservation Office's 'Waiver of Retroactivity' policy, allowing some real estate acquisition and protection project costs to be eligible for reimbursement despite being incurred prior to grant agreement, given that specific criteria are met. This policy is described in RCO/SRFB Acquiring Land: Policies, Manual #3 (March 8, 2007 or most recent edition).

Eligibility Information

Nearshore Database Records

For a project to be eligible for ESRP review it must have a corresponding record in the PRISM Nearshore Database. That record must be updated by the October 17, 2008 close of the RFP. Proposals for which there is not a corresponding record in the Nearshore Database by this deadline, will not be considered for review.

Eligible Applicants

Applicants may be state, federal, local, or tribal agencies, non-governmental or pseudo-governmental organizations, and private or public corporations.

Eligible Project Activities

Eligible projects must be:

1. Within Puget Sound (East of Cape Flattery), identified by a salmon recovery Lead Entity or Marine Resource Committee, and identified in a current salmon recovery, watershed, or nearshore habitat restoration or protection plan.
2. The primary purpose of the project must be to restore or protect Puget Sound Nearshore ecosystem processes or functions.
3. Projects with the primary objective of providing recreational access, or remediating chemical contamination are not eligible as stand-alone projects; however these activities may be eligible components of larger efforts.
4. Projects awards will not be provided for work that relieves obligatory compensation or mitigation requirements incurred by the sponsor or a third-party, as determined by the Nearshore Partnership or WDFW. Funding, however, may be provided for actions

associated with compensation or mitigation, if those elements are above and beyond the mitigation requirements and can be easily isolated from the required mitigation activities.

The Nearshore Partnership encourages careful analysis of nearshore ecosystem opportunities and constraints, and the creative application of combinations of diverse management measures to meet the substantial challenges of ecosystem protection and restoration.

Project evaluation is considered as part of the project lifecycle. Project evaluation elements will be considered for their ability to support future restoration or protection decision-making. Delivery of a thorough and technically sound evaluation strategy is considered a pre-requisite of evaluation funding, particularly for quantitative studies. ESRP is in the process of developing programmatic evaluation strategies for actions that benefit the nearshore ecosystem as informed by PSNERP strategy development.

Additional eligibility criteria may be applied based on requirements of authorizing statutes and agreements.

Matching Requirements

ESRP authorizing legislation has to date required that projects provide a match of cash or in-kind services equaling 33% of the ESRP award. This match must be incurred during the award period. Some of this match must be non-state funds. Match requirements are typically consistent with RCO-SRFB definitions; however, match eligibility will be determined on a case-by-case basis.

Application Review

Application Deadline

Proposals must be received in electronic format to the address or e-mail box indicated below by 11:59 PM, Friday, October 17, 2008. Proposals received after this time or not in the described format may be considered 'non-responsive' and discarded at the discretion of WDFW.

Projects applications must be complete to be considered for review. A complete application includes: 1) a complete project data sheet and a complete project budget worksheet (as found on the ESRP web site in a format readable by Excel 2000), 2) a budget narrative as described herein, and 3) a project narrative. Proposals received but not containing all three of these elements in the described format by the submission deadline may be considered 'non-responsive' and discarded at the discretion of WDFW. ESRP is not responsible for informing applicants of the completeness of applications prior to the RFP close date. All submittals received via e-mail will be provided with confirmation of receipt within 2 business days.

Submittal Address

Please send complete applications to:

Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
600 Capital Way N.
Olympia, WA 98501

Attn: Proposal Enclosed

OR

ESRP@dfw.wa.gov

Evaluation Objectives

Proposals are expected to provide accurate and precise information about predicted project benefits and costs. ESRP uses a competitive peer-reviewed ranking process to compare the costs and benefits of projects. Project benefits are principally described using a conceptual model that describes how nearshore ecosystem functions, goods and services will be changed by proposed project work. Review procedures are intended to evaluate anticipated whole project value. Applicants are strongly encouraged to present their project as a cohesive and complete restoration or protection action. Evaluation will result in definition of a ‘whole project scope’ consistent with ESRP project scoping guidelines ([ESRP Guidance](#), Appendix C), and a proposed funding level and scope of work.

During the project evaluation process, some projects may be identified as candidates for enhancement. Enhancements are developed by comparing Adaptive Management Objectives to opportunities presented by projects and the overall composition of the ESRP portfolio. Enhancement contracts are issued to sponsors or third parties, in association with a project or group of projects, to enhance restoration and protection capacity through completion of additional assessment, design, implementation or evaluation activities.

Evaluation Criteria

New project review criteria can be found in [ESRP Guidance](#), Appendix E. New project status categories are described in ESRP Guidance Appendix D, and are used to evaluate readiness to receive funding for specific phases of project work. Additional evaluation criteria may be applied based on intergovernmental review or other requirements described in appropriating legislation.

Projects seeking funding as part of the NOAA Community-based Nearshore Restoration Fund will be evaluated based on their ability to provide benefits to NOAA trust species, and

Review Process

Project ranking will be determined by a peer-review team, with a minimum of four reviewers per application. While review teams are composed of individuals with nearshore project experience, applicants should not assume any previous knowledge of project-specific conditions on the part of review team members.

During the review process there will be the opportunity for reviewers to provide the sponsor with a request for additional information. That list of questions will be provided by e-mail to the project contact and the alternate project contact. The sponsor contact or alternate contact will have 5 business days to provide an email response to that request for information. Reviewers will consider the response to those questions in developing final scores. We anticipate asking clarifying questions by e-mail on November 17, 2008 to all applicants. We will require response by e-mail by 11:59 PM, November 21, 2008.

Completion of peer review will result in a ranked list of projects. The ESRP review team will identify a whole project description, award amount, and the award scope of work in consultation with project proponents and consistent with [ESRP Guidance](#). The project description, award,

and award scope may differ from the proposal. Following award negotiation and approval by the Nearshore Partnership Steering Committee, ESRP will publish a draft spending plan for review by the 2009 State Legislature and Federal Funding Partners. Projects that have completed feasibility, and are being proposed for phased funding may be included in the ‘ESRP Portfolio’ (as described in [ESRP Guidance](#)), qualifying for streamlined application for supplemental funds.

Summary of Review Schedule

August 22, 2008	RFP published
September 15, 2008	Supplement to RFP published for clarification
October 17, 2008	Application deadline , PRISM Nearshore Database updates complete
November 17, 2008	Supplemental information request sent by e-mail
November 21, 2008	Response deadline for supplemental information
December 19, 2008	Work with sponsors to complete applications
January 14, 2009	Draft spending plan published
Spring, 2009	Final spending plan published with state capital budget
July 1, 2009	State capital funds available for contracting

Award Administration

Award notices

ESRP anticipates administering awards through contracts between project sponsors and WDFW. All discussion of award funding level, scope, and project implementation schedules are preliminary until publication of the Final Spending Plan and distribution of award notices. The project sponsor assumes full risks for any costs incurred prior to publication of the Final Spending Plan and subsequent award notification.

Contract information

Contracts will be developed and executed using documents similar to those found in Appendix J of [ESRP Guidance](#). These materials are provided as drafts for review and discussion and may not reflect final contract contents or details.

Projects selected for streamlined review in future spending plans (the ESRP Portfolio) are not assured funding in future spending plans. Project sponsors should not assume that funding of a project phase will result in funding of future phases.

Application Content Guidelines

Application Format

Please provide the complete proposal in an electronic format; either through email attachments or on a CD. Due to short timelines and limited staff please deliver the data sheet and budget table as a single XLS workbook (readable by Excel 2000), project narrative and budget narrative as a single MS Word™ or PDF document, and all other supporting materials as a second MS Word™ or PDF document, for a total of three electronic files per proposal. All files should be decipherable when printed on standard letter size paper. These three files can be delivered either as e-mail attachments of less than 10 megabytes per e-mail, or as files on a CD readable by a Windows™ operating systems.

Project Data Sheets

Each project proposal must contain a completed ESRP Project Data Sheet and Budget Worksheet in XLS format (as found on the [ESRP website](#)). Please provide all relevant information prior to submission of these worksheets. Please open and read the tab labeled ‘instruction’ and complete data entry for tabs labeled ‘project datasheet’ and ‘budget worksheet’.

All communications, some of which may affect eligibility or evaluation of proposals, will be completed by e-mail. Please carefully select primary contact and secondary contact e-mail addresses to reflect this importance of maintaining e-mail contact. ESRP communications will be sent ‘high priority’ and contain ‘ESRP’ in the subject line. ESRP is not responsible for lack of response following successful e-mail transmission to the two e-mail addresses provided by the sponsor.

Project Narrative

The project narrative should specifically and concisely respond to the ranking criteria as described in [ESRP Guidance](#)—Appendix E. The narrative may cite attached technical documents as necessary by page and paragraph. The attached project narrative template is provided for your convenience.

Project narrative is limited to eight pages of text (12 point font; single spaced). This limit does not include the budget narrative, a bibliography, or additional attachments useful for understanding the project.

Budget Narrative

The purpose of the program is to facilitate complete implementation of restoration and protection actions. To evaluate project costs, we require disclosure of whole project cost estimates, recognizing that an ESRP award may only result in phased funding. This initial worksheet and narrative will support subsequent ESRP Portfolio requests.

A complete budget narrative is necessary to evaluate whole project costs. You may use your own project budget spreadsheets to support the project budget worksheet, but budget narrative materials must allow reviewers to understand the purpose and source of cost estimates. The budget narrative should, at minimum, justify total task cost. The following guidance is provided for what is considered adequate justification. Absence of adequate justification will be inferred as meaning that costs are rough estimates not based on a project specific analysis.

‘Personnel’ refers to wages and salaries for staff engaged in project implementation. Narrative should break down costs by staff type, by rates, and hours. Identify project roles for whom a curriculum vitae or resume has been provided. Only include support staff if their time is not being considered for calculation of an indirect rate.

‘Fringe Benefits’ are those costs employers incur for providing a package of benefits beyond salary or wages, and can be described as a percentage of wage costs.

The description of **‘Travel’** should include the method used to calculate travel costs. (e.g. mileage rate; estimated miles traveled).

‘Equipment’ includes items with a value greater than \$5000, as well as ‘Inventoriable items’ with a value greater than \$300, including: vehicles, engines, licensed equipment, chain saws, space heaters, communications equipment, GPS units, optical devices and cameras, projectors, computers, and audio/video equipment. Please provide an itemized list of equipment.

‘Supplies’ are material costs that are not equipment. Please describe quantities and unit costs of supplies.

‘Contractual’ costs may not be finalized at the time of application. Individual contracts should be itemized with a brief description of scope, the basis for the estimate (i.e. engineers estimate, firm fixed bid, etc.) and the status of the contract (bid documents prepared, RFP released, etc.) Where labor costs are fixed and fully loaded (like a conservation corps crew day) they could be included as contractual costs.

‘Land’ refers to costs of real property, as based on appraisal or estimated costs of specifically identified parcels.

‘Other’ costs should be described by the nature of the expense and the method of estimation.

‘Indirect’ costs include a proportion of those costs related to overhead or administration that an organization incurs over the period of project implementation. The method of calculation must be clearly described. Indirect costs may not be funded by ESRP but may be used as match. Where support staff are critical to project implementation they can be included as personnel and described in the ‘Personnel’ narrative.

Additional Supporting Documents

The following supporting documents improve reviewers’ ability to evaluate projects based on criteria. Reviewers are instructed to treat absence of information as an indicator of insufficient capacity or resources.

- A resume or curriculum vitae for project managers and key technical staff.
- Evidence that the landowner is aware of the project and supportive of the application in cases where the landowner is not also the applicant.
- Maps or project site aerial photographs indicating the boundaries of proposed work. Please include Washington Department of Ecology oblique aerial photos if relevant.
- Design drawings useful for understanding project scope and configuration.

Resources

The following websites may provide additional information that supports your application:

ESRP website	http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/esrp.htm
Nearshore Partnership Publications	http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_reports.htm
PS Shared Strategy Regional Nearshore Chapter	http://www.psat.wa.gov/Programs/salmon_recovery/environments.htm
The Nature Conservancy Ecoregional Assessment	http://waconservation.org/ecoregionalAssessments.shtml
Coastal Habitats in Puget Sound - Research Plan	http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_papers/coastal_habitats.pdf
WA Dept of Ecology Oblique Aerial Photography	http://apps.ecy.wa.gov/shorephotos/index.html
WA Dept of Ecology Coastal Atlas	http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/SMA/atlas_home.html

The following template containing review criteria is provided for your convenience:

1) ECOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE (30 points)

1a) Priority Habitats (9 points)

- The project will protect or restore processes that are critical to the long-term maintenance and development of priority habitat functions/systems as demonstrated by a regional assessment or plan.
- Ideal projects are identified in both large-scale and local assessments that prioritize actions based on diverse ecosystem benefits. The evaluation of proposed work from the assessment is explicitly described in the proposal.

1b) Habitat Linkages (7 points)

- The project is positioned in the landscape to maximize benefits of restoration or protection by restoring or maintaining linkages between ecosystems.
- Specific position and extent of proposed work, is defined using maps. Relevant supporting projects are also located.
- Hypothesized relationships between project work and surrounding ecosystems are listed, explicitly described, and linked to cited assessments or research.

1c) Self-sustaining processes (8 points)

- The project is designed to minimize the need for ongoing maintenance or intervention to sustain nearshore functions.
- All factors that could substantially affect long-term sustainability of proposed benefits are listed and addressed. Such factors could include operations and maintenance, surrounding natural and anthropogenic stressors and processes, and uncertainty in management measures.

1d) At Risk Species (3 points)

- Long-term project benefits will be realized for populations currently managed as 'at risk' by state or federal authorities.
- 'At risk' species whose populations are expected to benefit are listed, their 'at risk' status identified, and direct benefits are supported by the conceptual model.

1e) Information Gap (3 points)

- The project design and subsequent evaluation of outcomes will fill an information gap critical to increase effectiveness and predictability of nearshore ecosystem restoration or protection. (e.g. CHIPS Research Plan link below)
- Hypotheses that will be answered by the proposed work are explicitly listed. Information gained is relevant based on ESRP adaptive management objectives.

2) TECHNICAL MERIT (30 Points)

2a) Conceptual Model (10 points)

- The project proponent will explain how the proposal will result in restoration or preservation of ecosystem processes, structures and functions.
- The conceptual model should consider the manner in which the proposed work will affect the natural interplay of ecosystem structure and process, and make quantitative and qualitative predictions

about how change in ecosystem structure and function will affect habitat functions. The model should consider all influential factors specific to the site, even if outside the scope of work or control.

2b) Interdisciplinary Review (4 points)

- The project design has received and incorporated interdisciplinary scientific review and input. (e.g. a Lead Entity Technical Committee)
- The individuals providing review should be identified, the intensity of review described, and specific critiques that caused a change in design should be listed. Review reports may be included as supporting materials.

2c) Probability of success (8 points)

- The stated project goals and objectives are likely to be achieved by the proposed action(s). The project design has addressed a wide range of factors that could affect the outcome.
- Reviewers must use best professional judgment to reconsider project predictions, determine if risks have been addressed, and evaluate if likely project outcomes have been accurately represented. The restoration action has considered the potential impacts of climate change.

2d) Monitoring (8 points)

- The project provides hypothesis-driven monitoring to demonstrate that goals and objectives will be met.
- Project performance metrics are listed. Success thresholds are identified. Methods for gathering data or observations are outlined in terms of timing, frequency, duration and intensity. Relative value of quantitative vs. qualitative methods has been considered.

3) READINESS (15 points)

3a) Qualifications (5 points)

- The proponent team has the demonstrated skills and capacity to complete the full project scope.
- Resume or CV of key staff demonstrate project management experience of similar scope and scale.

3b) Record of Success (5 points)

- The proponent team has successfully completed similar projects and is not currently delinquent on any other grant or contract.
- Previous awards should be listed, and grant manager contact information provided. Projects where full scope was not delivered under the proposed schedule should be identified. Previous ESRP contracts should be identified by PRISM number.

3c) Project Readiness (5 points)

- Projects will be evaluated for readiness as defined within each of the status categories.
- Evidence is described in status category readiness.
- A low score here may indicate a need to renegotiate status, scope, and funding level.

4) COST JUSTIFICATION (15 points)

4a) Cost-effectiveness (5 points)

- The relationship between expected outcomes and total project cost is appropriate for the project location.
- The total project cost should be described in the project cost worksheet and compared to typical project costs and benefits.

4b) Reasonable Budget (5 points)

- The budget is complete and includes all elements required for successful implementation, including contingency planning, post construction data collection, and maintenance.
- A complete ESRP total project cost worksheet describes whole project costs and is supported by a legible budget narrative. Tasks are well defined or consistent with the ESRP Standard Statement of Work.

4c) Match (5 points)

- The project leverages private and federal sources of funding to maximize protection and restoration benefits for requested funds.
- Secured and pending awards are listed by source, type, and award date. Unsecured whole project needs should be identified.

5) PUBLIC SUPPORT (10 points)

5a) Public Education (5 points)

- The project has a high potential for public education and the proponent has an effective project communications plan.
- Resources allocated to outreach should be identified in the budget narrative. Outreach outputs should be listed and included in the scope of work. Number of citizens engaged should be estimated and justified.

5b) Partnership (5 points)

- The project actively engages a range of local and regional partners that will support education, technology transfer, and stakeholder participation.
- Partnership is evidenced by diverse letters of support.