Snake River Lead Entity *Project Evaluation Criteria* - 2012

Project Title

Project Location:_____

Is the Project in the right area?

Project Tier	Points Possible	Description (applications that contain multiple project sites that are not all in the same priority area will be averaged based on each site location)
Tier I	50	Imminent threats. Habitat project(s) in an MSA and within a priority restoration/protection reach, or in mSA with a priority restoration reach; assessments in this category score 25 points
Tier II	40	Project(s) in an MSA but not in a priority reach; assessments in this category score 20 points
Tier III	30	Projects in an mSA and within a priority protection reach; assessments in this project category score 15 points
Tier IV	20	Project(s) in an mSA but not in a priority reach; assessments in this category score 10 points
Tier V	10	Project(s) not in an mSA; assessments in this category score 5 points.

Score

Habitat Factors Adressed:_____

How well is the project addressing limiting factors?

Project Tier	Points Possible	Description
Tier I	23 to 30	Project addresses an Imminent threat (dead fish observed at site) OR project that addresses 3 or more of the priority habitat factors listed in Table 14 for the identified MSA.
	20 to 22	Project is presumed to address an imminent threat (because it does not meet a NOAA or other ESA criteria) listed on Table 14 ; fish must use site
Tier II	11 to 20	Project(s)in an MSA that address 2 of the priority habitat factors listed in Table 14. Projects that are in an mSA and address two or more of the following protection strategies: upland, riparian and water conservation.
Tier III	0 to 10	Project(s) in an MSA that address 1 of the priority habitat factors listed in Table 14. Projects that are in an mSA and address one of the following protection strategies: upland, riparian or water conservation.

Score

Project Certainty

Will the project work?

	Points Possible	Description
	11 to 20	Project/assessment is based on proven scientific methods and will meet the intended objectives.
	1 to 10	Project/assessment is based on unproven methods but will likely meet its intended objectives.
	0	Project/assessment is based on proven scientific methods but will not likely meet intended objectives OR is based on speculative methods and will not likely meet its intended objectives

Score

Project Size

Is the on the ground project large enough to make a significant difference? Assessments are scored separately

Project Type	Points Possible	This section is to reward projects that are large and address multiple ubiquitous limiting factors; the points are additive to points received on page 1 and are additive across project types	
Riparian	10	>50 acres	
	6 to 9	25-49 acres	**Score**
	3 to 5	10-24 acres	
	2	<10 acres	
Instream Flow (during fish critical period)	10	>2 CFS	
	6 to 9	>1 but < 2 CFS	**Score**
	3 to 5	>0.5 but <1 CFS	
	1 or 2	<0.5 CFS	
Instream Habitat OR useable habitat opened	10	>1,000 lineal feet	
	6 to 9	500 to 999 feet	**Score**
	3 to 5	200 to 499 feet	
	1 or 2	< 200 feet	
Upland Best Management Practices	10	> 200 acres	
	6 to 9	100 to 199 acres	**Score**
	3 to 5	50 to 99 acres	
	1 or 2	< 50 acres	
Con-servation Easements[1]	10	Likelihood of development[1] is high based on information provided by sponsor	
	0	Likelihood of development[1] is moderate based on information provided by sponsor	**Score**
	-10	Likelihood of development[1] is low based on information provided by sponsor	

Assessments	Assessments (assessments must either lead to a project or fill an identified data gap)	35	Assessment of an imminent threat (fish passage barrier, screen, ford, de-watered reach) that **will** directly lead to a project	
		30	Assessments of stream/riparian/floodplain habitat that will identify protection or restoration actions in respectively designated priority reach	
		30	Assessment of uplands that may produce large sediment loads and is located in designated priority area	
		25	Assessment to address a level 4 critical uncertainty (data gap) as reported in Section 6 (Tables 6-2 thru 6-6) of the Regional Recovery Plan*	
		20	Assessment to address a level 3 critical uncertainty (data gap) as reported in Section 6 (Tables 6-2 thru 6-6) of the Regional Recovery Plan*	**Score**
		10	Assessment of public interest in habitat protection or restoration projects.	
		10	Assessments of stream/riparian/floodplain habitat that will identify protection or restoration actions in an area not designated a priority reach	
Cost	Cost/Benefit	up to 10	Committee may assign up to 10 points for cost:benefit relationship based on community values, past experience with project costs, cost-share, perceived project value relative to other proposed projects, number of ESA listed species and other considerations.	**Score**

Total Project Score

Lead Entity Committee Members Signature