Table 1 - Project Ranking Criteria

2007-2009 ESTUARY AND SALMON RESTORATION PROGRAM (ESRP) CRITERIA

Max. Points	#	Criteria	Definition
30	***1***	***ECOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE***	***The Project targets recovery of ecosystem processes and functions***
9	**1a**	**Priority Habitats**	The project will protect or restore processes that are critical to the long term maintenance and development of priority habitat functions/systems. Site identified/prioritized as important and supported by PS Shared Strategy Regional Nearshore Chapter, The Nature Conservancy's ecoregional planning framework, and/or other nearshore assessment(s). (see links below)
7	**1b**	**Habitat Linkages**	The project is positioned in the landscape to maximize benefits of restoration or protection by restoring or maintaining linkages between ecosystems.
8	**1c**	**Self-sustaining processes**	The project is designed to minimize the need for ongoing maintenance or interventions to sustain nearshore functions.
3	**1d**	**At Risk Species**	Long term project benefits will be realized for populations currently managed as 'at risk' by state or federal authorities.
3	**1e**	**Information Gap**	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)
30	***2***	***TECHNICAL MERIT***	***The project will result in the desired outcomes.***
10	**2a**	**Conceptual Model**	The project proponent will explain how the proposal will result in restoration or preservation of ecosystem processes, structures and functions.
4	**2b**	**Interdisciplinary Review**	The project design has received and incorporated interdisciplinary scientific review and input. **(**e.g. a Lead Entity Technical Committee**)**
8	**2c**	**Probability of success**	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.
8	**2d**	**Monitoring**	The project provides hypothesis-driven monitoring to demonstrate that goals and objectives will be met.
15	***3***	***READINESS***	***The project will be implemented quickly and effectively***
5	**3a**	**Qualifications**	The proponent team has the demonstrated skills and capacity to complete the full project scope.
5	**3b**	**Record of Success**	The proponent team has successfully completed similar projects and is not currently delinquent on any other grant or contract.
5	**3c**	**Project Readiness**	Projects will be evaluated for readiness as defined within each of the status categories. (see category definitions attached)
15	***4***	***COST JUSTIFICATION***	***The project plan maximizes benefits***
5	**4a**	**Cost-effectiveness**	The relationship between expected outcomes and total project cost is appropriate for the project location and type.
5	**4b**	**Reasonable Budget**	The budget is complete and includes all elements required for successful implementation, including contingency planning, post construction data collection, and maintenance.
5	**4c**	**Match**	The project leverages other sources of funding to maximize protection and restoration benefits for requested funds.
10	***5***	***PUBLIC SUPPORT***	***The project will build community support for protection and restoration***
5	**5a**	**Public Education**	The project has a high potential for public education and the proponent has an effective project communications plan.
5	**5b**	**Partnership**	The project actively engages a range of local and regional partners that will support education, technology transfer, and stakeholder participation.

PS Shared Strategy Regional Nearshore Chapter	http://www.psat.wa.gov/Programs/salmon_recovery/environments.htm
TNC Ecoregional Planning Framework	Available on CD-ROM
Coastal Habitat in Puget Sound (CHIPS) Plan	http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/techical_papers/coastal_habitats.pdf