



## **Content**

<b>Program Information .....</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>Application Review .....</b>	<b>6</b>
Contact Information .....	1	Application Deadline .....	6
Program Objectives.....	1	Submittal Address.....	6
Protecting and Restoring Nearshore		Evaluation Objectives .....	6
Ecosystem Processes.....	2	Evaluation Criteria .....	7
Enhancement Objectives.....	2	Review Process .....	7
Program Guidance .....	3	Summary of Review Schedule.....	7
<b>Award Information.....</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Award Administration.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Anticipated Funding Sources .....	3	Award notices .....	8
Project Award Period.....	4	Contract information.....	8
Phased Portfolio Funding.....	4	<b>Application Content Guidelines.....</b>	<b>8</b>
Waiver of Retroactivity.....	4	Application Format .....	8
<b>Eligibility Information.....</b>	<b>4</b>	Project Data Sheets .....	8
Nearshore Database Records - New .....	4	Project Narrative .....	9
Eligible Applicants.....	5	Budget Narrative.....	9
Eligible Project Activities .....	5	Additional Supporting Documents .....	10
Matching Requirements .....	5	<b>Resources .....</b>	<b>10</b>

## **Program Information**

### ***Contact Information***

Questions regarding this RFP should be directed towards Betsy Lyons, 360-902-2572, [ESRP@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:ESRP@dfw.wa.gov).

### ***Program Objectives***

The Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Recreation and Conservation Office, the Puget Sound Partnership, and partner organizations 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 G 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 and contribute to implementation of the Puget Sound Partnership’s Action Agenda. ESRP projects either, 1) provide substantial and cost effective restoration or protection of ecosystem functions, goods, and services, and/or 2) allow evaluation of cutting-edge ecosystem restoration tactics and strategies for the purpose of increasing efficiency and effectiveness of future activity.

## ***Protecting and Restoring Nearshore Ecosystem Processes***

The nearshore ecosystem of Puget Sound is a dynamic environment strongly shaped by physical and ecological processes. PSNERP guidance suggests that projects designed to protect and restore those 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. Appendix C of the [ESRP Guidance](#) provides a list of the target ecological processes that can best meet PSNERP objectives. Applicants are advised to consult this document as they prepare proposals and develop projects.

Beach projects that protect and/or restore sediment supply and transport are under-represented in the nearshore database and ESRP’s portfolio yet will be vital to fully address PSNERP’s nearshore protection and restoration objectives. We strongly encourage projects that restore or protect sediment supply.

## ***Enhancement Objectives***

ESRP recognizes that funding programs play a critical role in improving restoration practices and that field implementation offers a critical opportunity to evaluate tactics and strategies. ESRP manages its project portfolio under an adaptive management model, by planning scientific investigations to resolve management questions important for project success. Through the technical review processes, reviewers will be looking for projects that address critical questions or issues and may be candidates for enhancement funding. The following questions have been identified as having an impact on restoration practice, and could be answered through ESRP project enhancements and coordination:

### **Beach Systems**

- **What is the biotic response to changes in shoreline vegetation?** We would like to be able to predict how changes in shoreline vegetation affects shoreline dependant biota.
- **What is the biotic response to changes in beach profile and texture?** We would like to be able to predict how a change in beach structure will affect shoreline dependant biota.
- **What level of sediment supply is necessary to sustain beach structure?** We would like to be able to predict how change in rate of sediment supply will affect the structure of beach ecosystems both locally and at the scale of a drift cell.
- **How does the condition and configuration of beach ecosystems components affect ecosystem functions?** We would like to be able to predict the extent to which the presence and condition of creek mouths, backshore and low tide terrace features, and marine riparian zones, cumulatively affect ecosystem functions.

### **River Delta Systems**

- **How does variable extent of dike removal affect 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.
- **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.
- **How does tidal marsh channel character contribute to estuarine function?** We would like to be able to predict the effect of tidal channel structure on biotic community response for the purpose of evaluating actions that effect channel formation outcomes.
- **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.

- **How does the size and connectivity of delta habitat patches affect ecosystem functions?** We would like to be able to identify how the representation of wetland types, their size, and their connectivity to each other and alluvial processes affects the biological benefits of delta restoration.

#### **Embayments and Inlets**

- **What parameters can be used to best evaluate the effects of restoration, as well as shoreline and watershed development, on the habitat functions of embayments and coastal inlets?** We would like to more efficiently characterize and monitor changes in the function of embayments as a result of restoration or other changes in ecosystem structures and processes.

#### **Social Barriers to Restoration**

- **What factors determine whether a landowner installs shoreline armoring or is willing to remove shoreline armoring?** We would like to be able to predict the location of willing landowners for the purpose of protecting and restoring sediment supply and transport within segments of drift cells or across a whole drift cell.
- **How can river delta restoration provide multiple benefits to delta residents?** We would like to be able to develop restoration strategies within river deltas that engage and provide increased ecosystem services to local stakeholders.

In addition, the development of beach restoration actions that restore historic sediment supply and transport for the benefit of beach dependant biota is a critical area for development. Such projects will be given consideration as part of development of our enhancement proposals.

Achievement of these objectives may involve collaboration in monitoring across projects, or increasing or changing the scope of a proposal to increase the effectiveness of monitoring. Projects can increase their competitiveness by developing robust investigations that are likely to increase knowledge that improves restoration practice. In addition elements of proposals may be identified and advanced as part of the development of Enhancements as described in Appendix A (Learning Strategy) of the [ESRP Guidance](#).

### ***Program Guidance***

Additional program information can be found at the [Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program](#) and [PSNERP](#) web pages including materials summarizing our understanding of the processes and functions of the nearshore ecosystem. A new edition of the ESRP Strategy and Guidance document ([ESRP Guidance](#)) has been published and posted in association with this RFP. This document provides details related to the development of the 2011 Spending Plan development, including:

- A description of the ESRP stewardship and learning strategy (Appendix A),
- A list of PSNERP draft objectives and target ecological processes (Appendix C),
- A definition of what constitutes a ‘project’ (Appendix D),
- A description of project status categories and associated evidence of readiness (Appendix F),
- The evaluation criteria that will be used to rank your project (Appendix G),
- A summary of PSNERP Management Measures (Appendix I), and
- A summary of the PSNERP shoreline classification (Appendix J).

### **Award Information**

#### ***Anticipated Funding Sources***

This RFP will be used to develop the 2011 ESRP Spending Plan. This spending plan will distribute funds from 2011/13 state appropriations. ESRP will continue to seek external

partnerships with other agencies or organizations that could take advantage of ESRP's Spending Plan to distribute other sources of funding for Puget Sound protection and restoration efforts.

ESRP anticipates \$7.5 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. Previous awards have ranged from \$25,000 to \$2,600,000. Final award amount and scope may differ from proposed amounts, and will reflect a thorough evaluation of spending plan alternatives, and a project sponsor's 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, 2011 and June 30, 2013.

### ***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 or "portfolio" process 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. Portfolio projects may apply for supplemental funds without preparing a full competitive application. ***Portfolio projects may request funding during the application period by completing a portfolio project status update sheet and revised budget with the new funding request.***

### ***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 which can be found at: [http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual\\_3\\_acq.pdf](http://www.rco.wa.gov/documents/manuals&forms/Manual_3_acq.pdf).

## **Eligibility Information**

### ***Nearshore Database Records - New***

For a project to be eligible for ESRP review it must have a corresponding record in the newly developed, [Puget Sound Nearshore Projects Data Site](#) (Nearshore Data Site) or in [Habitat Work Schedule](#) (HWS) and identified as a nearshore project. Instructions on data entry is available on the [ESRP website](#). New and updated records must be in the nearshore data portal or HWS by the close of the RFP on October 19, 2010. Proposals without a corresponding record by this deadline will not be considered for review. In previous grant cycles, the nearshore database resided in RCO's PRISM. This year, project sponsors will only be asked to enter information in PRISM if they are awarded funds. *For assistance adding or updating your project record in HWS, please work with your local lead entity coordinator. For assistance with the nearshore*

*data portal or to obtain a user account, contact Jenna Norman, 360-902-2658 or [jenna.norman@dfw.wa.gov](mailto:jenna.norman@dfw.wa.gov).*

### ***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 Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project 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 Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project and ESRP encourage 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 (i.e. evaluating the completed project elements) 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 project evaluation strategy is considered a pre-requisite for evaluation funding, particularly for quantitative studies.

Additional eligibility criteria may be applied based on requirements imposed by authorizing statutes and agreements following this RFP.

### ***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, Monday, October 18, 2010. Proposals received after this time or not in the described format may not be considered for competition at the discretion of WDFW.

Projects applications must be complete to be considered for review. A complete application for new projects includes: 1) a complete project budget worksheet, 2) a budget narrative as described herein, and 3) a project narrative. A complete application for portfolio projects includes 1) projects status update and 2) updated budget with new funding requests. Proposals received but not containing all three of these elements in the described format by the submission deadline may not be considered for competition 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:

Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife  
HABITAT - Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program  
PO Box 43143  
Olympia, WA 98504-3143  
*Attn: Proposal Enclosed*

OR

[ESRP@dfw.wa.gov](mailto: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 (Appendix D, [ESRP Guidance](#)), 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***

Project review criteria can be found in [ESRP Guidance](#), Appendix G. Project status categories are described in ESRP Guidance Appendix F, 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 by funding partners or other requirements described in appropriating legislation.

Projects likely to rank well are those that best address criteria and protect or restore the target ecological processes identified in PSNERP objectives as found in [ESRP Guidance](#), Appendix C.

ESRP awards require completion of a scope of work within a specific timeframe. Competitive proposals are specific about the scope and schedule of proposed work and the distribution of ESRP and matching funds across the whole project scope.

### ***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 16, 2008 to all applicants. We will require response by e-mail by 11:59 PM, November 23 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 ratification by the PSNERP Steering Committee, ESRP will publish a draft spending plan for review by the 2011 State Legislature and any Federal or State 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***

<b>September 27, 2010</b>	<b>RFP published</b>
<b>October 19, 2010</b>	<b>Application deadline, Nearshore Data Site updates complete</b>
November 16, 2010	Supplemental information request sent to sponsors by e-mail
<b>November 23, 2010</b>	<b>Response deadline for supplemental information</b>

January 2011	Draft spending plan published <sup>1</sup>
Spring, 2011	Final spending plan published with state capital budget
July 1, 2011	State capital funds available for contracting

## **Award Administration**

### ***Award notices***

ESRP awards will be administered through contracts between project sponsors and the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office, ESRP's fiscal partner. 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 RCO documents. These materials will be made available upon request. 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 we request that application material be submitted in no more than three electronic files per proposal:*

- **Document 1:** budget table as a single XLS workbook (readable by Excel 2000)
- **Document 2:** project narrative and budget narrative as a single MS Word™ or PDF document.
- **Document 3:** and all other supporting materials as a second MS Word™ or PDF document.

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 Windows™ operating systems.

### ***Project Data Sheets and Data Site Entry***

Each project proposal must be accompanied by a Budget Worksheet in XLS format (as found on the [ESRP website](#)) and a corresponding record in [Habitat Work Schedule](#) (HWS) or the Puget

---

<sup>1</sup> Date of publication or draft Spending Plan is dependent upon the January meeting schedule of the Puget Sound Partnership's Leadership Council which has not formalized their 2011 calendar.

Sound [Nearshore Projects Data Site](#). The “project data sheet” used in previous grant cycles will be replaced by the required entry in the Nearshore Data Site or HWS.

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 G. 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, or may only pay for a portion of whole project costs. Competitive projects define a whole project scope of work, and accompanying whole project cost estimates. Applicants will not be required to meet future cost projections that are outside the proposed phase of work. The discussion of full project scope and costs increases confidence in the feasibility of the project and that ecosystem benefits will be delivered.

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, thereby reducing confidence in the project status.

**‘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 are not eligible for funding or as match contribution.

***Additional Supporting Documents***

The following suggested 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	<a href="http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/esrp.htm">http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/esrp.htm</a>
Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP): Publications	<a href="http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_reports.htm">http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_reports.htm</a>
PSNERP: Change Analysis Geodatabases	<a href="http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/PublicMenu/Menu.cfm?sitename=PSNERP&amp;pagename=Change_Analysis">http://www.nws.usace.army.mil/PublicMenu/Menu.cfm?sitename=PSNERP&amp;pagename=Change_Analysis</a>
Puget Sound Partnership- Action Agenda	<a href="http://www.psp.wa.gov/aa_action_agenda.php">http://www.psp.wa.gov/aa_action_agenda.php</a>
Puget Sound Partnership- Salmon Recovery and Watershed Work Plans	<a href="http://www.psp.wa.gov/documents.php#SRP">http://www.psp.wa.gov/documents.php#SRP</a>
The Nature Conservancy Ecoregional Assessment	<a href="http://waconservation.org/ecoregionalAssessments.shtml">http://waconservation.org/ecoregionalAssessments.shtml</a>
Puget Sound Nearshore Projects Data Site	<a href="http://www.psnerp.ekosystem.us/">http://www.psnerp.ekosystem.us/</a>

Habitat Work Schedule	<a href="http://hws.ekosystem.us/">http://hws.ekosystem.us/</a>
Coastal Habitats in Puget Sound - Research Plan	<a href="http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_papers/coastal_habitats.pdf">http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_papers/coastal_habitats.pdf</a>
WA Dept of Ecology Oblique Aerial Photography	<a href="http://apps.ecy.wa.gov/shorephotos/index.html">http://apps.ecy.wa.gov/shorephotos/index.html</a>
WA Dept of Ecology Coastal Atlas	<a href="http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/SMA/atlas_home.html">http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/SMA/atlas_home.html</a>

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

***PROJECT SUMMARY, TASKS AND TIMELINE***

**HWS or Nearshore Data Site URL:** please provide the direct link to your project’s record in HWS or the Nearshore Data Site.

**Project Summary-** provide a short narrative describing your project.

**Non-Mitigation Statement**

- Please check here to affirm this project is not associated with a mitigation or other compensatory restoration project, system, or bank, either through a shared footprint, adjacency, design, financing, or other mechanisms.

**Tasks and Timeline-** provide a list of the major project tasks that would be completed with ESRP funding. Indicate how the proposed work would be completed within the award period and consistent with the budget. For construction projects, please itemize the actions or management measures to be completed, including quantitative estimates where possible.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Phase</b>	<b>Notes</b>	<b>Status</b>	<b>Target Date</b>
<b>Acquisition</b>	<b>Protection</b>		<b>Completed</b>	
<b>Feasibility Study</b>	<b>Feasibility</b>		<b>Completed</b>	
<b>Final Design</b>	<b>Design</b>		<b>Completed</b>	
<b>Permits</b>	<b>Design</b>		<b>Completed</b>	
<b>Monitoring/Stewardship Plan</b>	<b>Design</b>		<b>Proposed ESRP</b>	<b>9/11</b>
<b>Contractor selection/bid award</b>	<b>Implement</b>		<b>Proposed ESRP</b>	<b>3/12</b>
<b>Construction</b>	<b>Implement</b>		<b>Proposed ESRP</b>	<b>7/12-10/12</b>
<i>Armor removal</i>	<b>Implement</b>	<b>Remove 100 ft. of armoring</b>		<b>7/12-9/12</b>
<i>Topography restoration</i>	<b>Implement</b>	<b>Remove fill</b>		<b>7/12-9/12</b>
<i>Revegetation</i>	<b>Implement</b>	<b>Plant native vegetation along 50 ft of shoreline</b>		<b>10/12</b>
<b>Monitoring</b>	<b>Evaluate</b>		<b>Proposed ESRP and future</b>	<b>5/13</b>
<b>Reporting</b>	<b>Admin</b>		<b>Future</b>	

## **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

### ***1) ECOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE (30 points)***

#### **1a) Priority Habitats (9 points)**

- The project will protect or restore ecosystem processes that are critical to the long-term maintenance and development of priority habitat functions/systems as demonstrated by a regional assessment or plan (e.g. Action Agenda, PSNERP documents, Ecoregional Assessments, species recovery plans etc).
- Ideal projects are those that restore or protect target ecological processes identified by PSNERP in Appendix C of the ESRP Guidance) and are identified in both large-scale and local assessments such as 3-year watershed plans that prioritize actions based on diverse ecosystem benefits. The assessment's opinion of proposed work is explicitly described.

#### **1b) Habitat Linkages (7 points)**

- The project is positioned in the landscape to maximize benefits of restoration or protection by restoring or maintaining landscape connectivity and 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 would protect functioning ecosystems or restore degraded ecosystem processes. The project addresses the cause of degradation at a scale that is self-sustaining. 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.
- Maximum points would be provided to projects that fully restore or protect ecosystem processes.

#### **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. The project will restore or protect an ecosystem that has experienced significant loss in size or quantity in Puget Sound or sub-basin or that contains rare, vulnerable or ecologically important species or resources

#### **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 such as cumulative impacts. Implementation is likely to enhance delivery of ecosystem functions, goods and services.
- 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 demonstrates 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 and/or in-kind donations.