ESTUARY & SALMON RESTORATION PROGRAM

Advancing nearshore protection and restoration

Small Grants Program

REQUEST FOR PROJECT PROPOSALS

MARCH 5, 2018

2019-21

INVESTMENT PLAN

The Estuary and Salmon Restoration Program (ESRP) Small Grants Program (SGP) seeks exemplary nearshore ecosystem restoration and protection projects. This program works to engage local communities by bringing together multiple stakeholders and partners seeking local solutions to complex ecosystem and land use problems.

In 2016, ESRP initiated the SGP pilot program to assist ESRP's mission in restoring the natural processes that create and sustain the Puget Sound nearshore ecosystem. The pilot was a success and from its efforts, ESRP will continue the SGP for the 2018 Grant Round.

The SGP is jointly administered by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW) and Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO). RCO functions as ESRP's fiscal agent.

We seek projects of local importance that provide significant contributions to regional goals. These projects will focus on nearshore ecosystem restoration or protection of ecosystem functions, goods, and services. Our work is centered on the scientific principles and strategies of the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project (PSNERP). The ESRP will dedicate at least $500,000 for the SGP depending on the 2019 -2021 Washington Capital Budget appropriation to ESRP.

Proposed project actions will be evaluated on project costs and benefits. A competitive review of proposals will result in a ranked project list.

PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The most competitive SGP proposals will be those that employ management measures that can most address the source of degradation of these natural processes or that are focused on protection of intact areas.

Successful projects will include one or more of the following management measures:

- Remove dikes, culverts, and fill to allow water to flow naturally to the nearshore
- Remove bulkheads from the nearshore
- Remove or modify piers and docks
- Create habitat for native plants and animals
- Remove non-native plants and animals
- Remove debris and unneeded structures and protect the nearshore from harmful pollutants
- Protect important nearshore area for plants, animals, fish and people
- Return native plants and animals to the nearshore
- Work together to ensure continued understanding and enjoyment of nearshore resources

CONTACT INFORMATION

Questions regarding this RFP should be directed towards:

> Jay Krienitz, ESRP Manager - Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
> (360) 902-2572, **jay.krienitz@dfw.wa.gov,** or

> Mike Ramsey, ESRP/Salmon Project Manager - Recreation and Conservation Office
> (360) 902-2969, **mike.ramsey@rco.wa.gov,** or

> Jenna Jewett, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
> (360) 902-2658, **jenna.jewett@dfw.wa.gov**

FUNDING AND ELIGIBILITY INFORMATION

The minimum funding limit for proposed projects is $30,000. The maximum limit is $150,000. Project awards are for work to be completed between July 1, 2019 and June 30, 2021.

MATCHING REQUIREMENTS

Projects must provide a match of cash or in-kind services equaling 30% of the award. This match must be incurred according to RCO policies. 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.

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

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

ELIGIBLE PROJECT TYPES

- Pre-construction planning/design
- Feasibility and/or Design
- Construction
- Restoration
- Pre and post-construction assessment elements

ELIGIBLE PROJECT SPONSORS

- Marine Resources Committees
- Non-profit organizations
- Lead entities
- Tribes
- RFEGs
- Special Purpose Districts
- Counties, cities, and towns
- State and federal agencies
- Academic Institutions

PROJECT CRITERIA

1. Project sites/project types within Puget Sound (East of Cape Flattery to the Canadian border) Nearshore. The nearshore zone is the narrow ribbon of land and shallow water that rings Puget Sound. It includes the shoreline bluffs, the tidal portions of streams and rivers, and shallow water areas out to a depth where sunlight no longer supports marine vegetation.

2. Proposed projects must support goals and objectives in the project area's local Marine Resources Committee (MRC) Strategic Plan or Lead Entity Plan/Lead Integrating Organization. Proposals that fall within a MRC area must support goals and objectives within the MRC Strategic Plan. These project proposals must include the Strategic Plan Review Form from by the MRC in your geographic area. Proposals that fall within an area without an MRC must support the Lead Entity/Lead Integrating Organization Plan. These project proposals must include the Strategic Plan Review Form by the Lead Entity in your geographic area (see Appendix A).

3. The primary purpose of the project must be to restore or protect Puget Sound nearshore ecosystem processes or functions, and to additionally support strategies that restore or protect ecosystem function of a geographic area such as a Process Unit (delta, drift cell, etc.)

4. Each project is required to include a communication plan as a project deliverable if awarded funding. We expect a straight forward plan ranging from 1-5 pages. (See Appendix C: Other Resources for links to examples of communication plans.)

5. Projects must include one of the following project types: Construction, Design/Feasibility, Restoration, or Pre-Construction planning/design. Additional project types may be any listed under "Eligible Project Types."

6. Projects with the primary objective of providing recreational access, or remediating chemical contamination are not eligible.

7. Projects that receive 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 are not eligible. Funding 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.

SMALL GRANTS PROJECTS APPLICATION SCHEDULE

TASK	DATE	DESCRIPTION
RFP published	March 5	Request for proposals to ESRP mailing list and posted on website.
Intent to Submit and Pre-application Site Visit deadline	April 12	Deadline to fill out Intent to Submit survey, and request a pre-application site visit. https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/SmallGrantsProgram
Pre-application site visits	April 23 – May 11	In-person site visits with members of the ESRP team.
Proposals due	July 18, 2018, 11:59 PM	See application process steps and criteria. Proposals submitted via PRISM.
2018 ESRP Preliminary Investment Plan Submitted	September 1	Ranked project list and funding recommendations published and submitted to Governor Inslee and the Washington Legislature.
Funding notification	TBD	Funding notification dependent upon final 2019-21 state budget. Funds available July 1, 2019

Proposal Due Date: Proposals must be submitted by midnight July 18, 2018 through the PRISM Online application process. Proposals received after this time may not be considered.

Requirements: Applicants must submit their proposal through PRISM Online. Proposals requesting funding greater than $10,000 for assessment or outreach/education activities should separate those elements in the proposal. This will provide clarity when evaluating proposals. **Projects must enter the project name in PRISM using the naming convention of "SGP Project Name."**

Application Submittal: Proposals may be submitted beginning March 1, 2018 and must be submitted by July 18, 2018 through the PRISM online application process.

> **PRISM**: The ESRP grant application process will be managed by PRISM Online. Instructions are provided online via a PRISM "grant application wizard" that will walk applicants through the application process. If you already have a project currently in PRISM, you may contact Mike Ramsey to consider duplicating that project record in order to streamline your ESRP project proposal as part of this grant competition.

Questions/Assistance:

> To obtain a PRISM User Account or gain access to PRISM Online, go to RCO's website at:
> **http://www.rco.wa.gov/prism_app/about_prism.shtml**
>
> For technical questions or issues with PRISM, contact:
> Scott Chapman, Recreation and Conservation Office - **scott.chapman@rco.wa.gov**
>
> For questions about application requirements, contact ESRP staff:
> Jay Krienitz - **jay.krienitz@dfw.wa.gov** or Jenna Jewett - **jenna.jewett@dfw.wa.gov**

APPLICATION REQUIREMENTS & FORMAT

Items #2-6 will be document attachments submitted through PRISM Online. Templates are provided for each of these on ESRP's website and referenced in Appendix A as part of this RFP.

1) **INTENT TO SUBMIT** (Survey Monkey form)

Applicants may complete the Intent to Submit survey found at the following web link https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/SmallGrantsProgram, by Thursday, April 12, 2018. Information in this survey is also required to register for a Pre-application Site Visit.

2) **BUDGET WORKSHEET** (MS Excel)

Applicants must complete and submit ESRP's Small Grant Program budget worksheet. This worksheet presents project costs defined by project tasks (e.g., feasibility, design, construction) and by object class (e.g., salaries, supplies, contract expenses). The worksheet must be supported by the budget narrative and/or other supporting materials that justify task costs. Project funding is typically limited to what sponsors can commit to accomplish within a 2 year award period. It is understood that the project costs are estimates and exact amounts will be defined at the contract stage.

This is an Excel-format document and is included as a separate file. The following budget categories apply:

- '**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 which 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 $5,000, 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'** 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.

3) **VISUAL SCOPE OF WORK** (Image/JPEG)

The visual scope of work is a map that clearly articulates the present and future vision for the project site or project sites. Create the map to the best of your abilities using available resources (e.g., GIS, desktop publishing software, aerial imagery with hand-drawn markups, etc.). Washington Department of Ecology oblique aerial photos can be useful for this exercise. The visual scope of work does not need to be professional quality. Choose the best component that creates a visual demonstration of the vision for the project. Do not submit formal design documents unless they are **1- 2 pages** at most and fulfill the criteria stated here.

To fulfill state requirements, maps must show the geographic areas where a project may change directly or indirectly the character or use of land. This information is used to assess where a project may affect historic properties or archaeological resources. The map must include a polygon of the entire project area and should show location- identifying features (such as section, township and range). For most projects a topographic or aerial photo base map is most appropriate.

4) **LANDOWNER ACKNOWLEDGEMENT** (MS Word or PDF)

Complete the landowner acknowledgement form provided and demonstrate that all affected landowners are aware of the project and supportive of the application (in cases where the landowner is not also the applicant.) If there is landowner conflict or uncertainties to the project proposal, please provide rationale and how the project sponsor proposes to manage that circumstance.

5) **NARRATIVE (3,750 words or less)** - See Appendix B for details

a. **Budget Narrative** (450 words or less)
Budget narrative materials must allow reviewers to understand the purpose and source of cost estimates. The budget narrative must justify total task cost. 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.

b. **Project Narrative** (3,300 words or less). **This produces the technical ranking and scoring worksheet**.
Applicants should use the proposal template for detailed criteria to create the project narrative (not to exceed 3,300 words). Project narratives will clearly state the project objectives, the site-level problem(s), and the plan for resolving the problem(s).

- How will the project improve or protect ecosystem processes outside of the individual site?
- What are the realistic obstacles to project outcomes and how will those obstacles be addressed?

c. **Identify the Shoreline Process Unit (SPU) or Delta Process Unit (DPU)**

As part of your project narrative, proposals must identify the 'nearshore ecosystem site' (process unit) in which their project is located. This information is used by ESRP and the technical evaluation team in linking proposed actions to PSNERP strategic recommendations for restoration and protection which are made at the process unit scale.

The Nearshore Data Site map has a feature that allows users to select an area of interest and view summary data including the process unit number(s) for a site. Once at the site, access the information with these instructions:

- Select "Change Layers" icon near the top right of the screen
- In the pop-up box, Click "+" next to WDFW_HWS_ PSNERP_2013
- In the pop-up box, Click "+" next to PSNERP
- Check the box next to "Process Units"
- Zoom to area of interest (SPU/DPU numbers will show when zoomed to 2000 ft. or closer)

d. **Project Evaluation Criteria Categories**

Ecological Importance	(30 points)
Public Support and Involvement	(25 points)
Technical Merit and Readiness	(30 points)
Cost Justification	(15 points)

6) MARINE RESOURCES COMMITTEE OR LEAD ENTITY/LEAD INTEGRATING ORGANIZATION STRATEGIC PLAN REVIEW FORM (MS Word or PDF)

Applicants must provide a Strategic Plan Review Form from their local Marine Resources Committee or if they are in a geographic area without an MRC, then they need to submit a form from their Lead Entity/Lead Integrating Organization. This form must be signed by the Committee Chair/President and include the names of Committee Members and their affiliations.

7) ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING DOCUMENTS (MS Word, PDF, Image, JPEG, etc.)

The following supporting documents improve the ability of reviewers to evaluate projects. Reviewers are instructed to treat absence of information as an indicator of insufficient capacity or resources. Suggested supporting documents:

- Letters of support from affected landowners, tribes, agencies, etc.
- Feasibility studies and design drawings (if applicable) useful for understanding project scope and configuration.
- Monitoring or stewardship plans if available.

8) PRISM ONLINE APPLICATION WIZARD /CONTRACT SYSTEM (Internet)

PRISM Online will walk grant applicants through an "application wizard" that will ensure a complete application package. PRISM requires applicants to document project information as part of RCO's grant contracting policies. Some of this information is repetitive from the ESRP grant application materials that are described above (#2-6). Applicants will be required to enter project information during the step-by-step PRISM system, with ESRP grant application attachments (the bulk of your application materials) uploaded in the final step of that process. While some of the information required in PRISM will not directly influence the technical evaluation process, it is required for all projects awarded ESRP funds.

EVALUATION AND REVIEW PROCESS

Proposals are expected to provide accurate and precise information about predicted project benefits and costs.

Review Opportunity #1. Pre-application site visits:

The ESRP Implementation Team will use information collected during the optional pre-application site visits (April 23 – May 11) to note highlights about projects for the technical team review. Some common notations by the ESRP Implementation Team may include the following:

- Ideal for ESRP or consider other more appropriate funding source …
    - Encourage funding by ESRP or a more appropriate source, better aligned with project goals.
- Ready to proceed or not ready…
    - If "not ready" comment is noted it is for projects with design or feasibility issues that are anticipated to strongly affect ecosystem benefits or implementation timing that cannot be expediently resolved through contract negotiation.
- Process-based or not process-based …
    - Project is or is not consistent with process-based approach to restoration.

The project sponsors and ESRP implementation team will be able to discuss any important considerations that are revealed during the site visit that can be addressed in the final submission of grant application materials. This will provide a more clear and robust proposal.

Sign up for pre-application site visits at: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/SmallGrantsProgram

Review Opportunity #2. Application Materials

Proposal material will be evaluated by the ESRP SGP evaluation team using the relevant ESRP criteria provided in Appendix B. A ranked list will be developed based on reviewer scores. Once the list is developed there will be no changes to the project ranking.

ESRP's technical review team may evaluate Near Term Actions (NTA) that have been submitted as part of the 2018 Action Agenda (AA) NTA Solicitation for this opportunity, depending on alignment of both the AA and ESRP process. ESRP will notify any NTA owners if their proposed project has been selected as a good fit for ESRP funding. Additional information may be required for final consideration. All NTA projects considered within this SGP opportunity are evaluated against criteria within this RFP. If an NTA project proposal is evaluated by the ESRP SGP technical team, any ranking priority determined through the Action Agenda NTA solicitation review process will not necessarily impact the ranking priority of the ESRP SGP process.

AWARD AND CONTRACT INFORMATION

ESRP Small Grant Program awards will be administered through contracts between project sponsors and the Washington State Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO), 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 risk for any costs incurred prior to publication of the Final Spending Plan and subsequent award notification.

Contracts will be developed and executed using RCO documents. These materials will be made available upon request. Projects receiving federal funds must also comply with the relevant federal terms and conditions associated with the funding agency.

APPENDIX A: RESTORATION APPLICATION TEMPLATES

The following templates are examples of the separate documents to include as part of the 2018 ESRP Small Grants Program application materials. The templates below will need to be downloaded from ESRP's grants page at www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/esrp/application_materials.html.

BUDGET WORKSHEET

Applicants must complete and submit ESRP's SGP budget worksheet that presents project costs defined by project tasks (e.g. feasibility, design, and construction) and by object class (e.g. salaries, supplies, contract expenses). The worksheet must be supported by the budget narrative and/or other supporting materials that justify tasks costs. Project funding is typically limited to what sponsors can commit to accomplish within 2- year award periods. It is understood that the project costs are estimates and exact amounts defined at the contract stage. This is an Excel-format document and is included as a separate file.

ESRP Small Grant Program BUDGET WORKSHEET

Budget worksheet Instructions provided on 'instructions' tab and additional information in RFP text.

Date of application

#	Tasks	Personnel	Fringe	Travel	Equipment	Supplies	Contractual	Funding Request	Match Type	Source A	Source B	Source C	Total Match	Additional Grant Funds	TOTAL PROJECT COST
		Funding Request Amount							Match						
1								0					0		0
2								0					0		0
3								0					0		0
4								0					0		0
5								0					0		0
6								0					0		0
7								0					0		0
8								0					0		0
9								0					0		0
10								0					0		0
11								0					0		0
12								0					0		0
13								0					0		0
14								0					0		0
15								0					0		0
16								0					0		0
17								0					0		0
18								0					0		0
19								0					0		0
20								0					0		0
	TOTAL	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		0

VISUAL SCOPE OF WORK

Please create a map that clearly articulates the present and future possible vision for the project site. Create the map to the best of your abilities, either utilizing GIS, desktop publishing software, aerial imagery with hand-drawn outlines, or an artistic rendering. Please include Washington Department of Ecology oblique aerial photos if relevant. The visual scope of work does not need to be professional quality. Choose the best component that creates a visual demonstration of the vision for the project. Do not submit formal design documents unless they are **1-2 pages** at most and fulfill the need stated above.

Below is a very high quality demonstration of a visual scope of work:

LANDOWNER ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Provide acknowledgement that all affected landowners are aware of the project and supportive of the application in cases where the landowner is not also the applicant. If there is landowner conflict or uncertainties to the project proposal, please provide rationale and how project sponsor proposes to deal with it. The Landowner Acknowledgement Form is available as part of the ESRP online application documents. A separate word document version of this form will be included in the RFP communication. Go to the ESRP grants webpage for the form:
www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/esrp/application_materials.html

Landowner Acknowledgement Form

Landowner Information

Name of Landowner:
Landowner Contact Information:
☐ Mr.   ☐ Ms.   Title:
First Name: Last Name:
Contact Mailing Address:
Contact E-Mail Address:
Property Address or Location:

1. _____ (Landowner or Organization) is the legal owner of property described in this grant application.

2. I am aware that the project is being proposed on my property.

3. If the grant is successfully awarded, I will be contacted and asked to engage in negotiations.

4. My signature does not represent authorization of project implementation.

5. If I am affiliated with the project sponsor, I will recuse myself from decisions made by the project sponsor to work on or purchase my property.

_____   _____
Landowner Signature   Date

Project Sponsor Information

Project Name:
Project Applicant Contact Information:
☐ Mr.   ☐ Ms.   Title
First Name: Last Name:

Mailing Address: E-Mail Address:

ESRP | February 2018

MARINE RESOURCES COMMITTEE, LEAD ENTITY, LOCAL INTEGRATING ORGANIZATION STRATEGIC PLAN REVIEW FORM

Applicants must provide a Strategic Plan Review Form from their local Marine Resources Committee, Lead Entity, or Local Integrating Organization. This form must be signed by the Committee Chair/President and include the names of Committee Members and their affiliations. Go to the ESRP grants page webpage for the form www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/esrp/application_materials.html.

MRC/LE/LIO Strategic Plan Review Form

Marine Resources Committee or Lead Entity/Local Integrating Organization Strategic Plan Review Form

MRC/LE/LIO Information	**Project Sponsor Information**
MRC/LE/LIO:	Project Name:
MRC/LE/LIO Contact Information:	Project Applicant Contact Information:
☐ Mr. ☐ Ms. Title:	☐ Mr. ☐ Ms. Title
First Name:	First Name:
Last Name:	Last Name:
Contact Mailing Address:	Mailing Address:
Contact E-Mail Address:	E-Mail Address:

1. The _____ MRC/LE/LIO has been given information regarding this project.

   Please check the box that best describes the method of information delivery:

   ☐ Presentation to MRC/LE/LIO

   ☐ Proposal packet with detailed information

   ☐ Other, please describe _____

2. Does this project proposal meets the goals and objectives of the MRC/LE/LIO's Strategic Plan?

   ☐ Yes

   ☐ No

3. Please provide comments on page 3.

_____   _____
MRC/LE/LIO Chair   Date

ESRP Small Grants Program • February 2018

NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION

Budget Narrative

Complete a project budget. Describe what funding has been secured already, other pending or planned grant proposals and remaining need. For pending match, describe current status if known. Describe how you will intend to secure the required 30% matching funds for ESRP and remaining funds needed to start implementation.

Project Narrative and Criteria for Evaluation

Project proposals are reviewed and scored using four primary criteria. Each criterion is broken down into a number of sub-criteria each associated with evidence that sponsors can provide to demonstrate how a project meets criteria and sub-criteria. How well an applicant provides evidence will determine many points they receive for a given sub-criteria. For evaluation, Ecological Importance and Technical Merit are generally evaluated within the context of the "whole project" not just the current phase being proposed. For other criteria, evaluation will focus on the current phase of effort.

Project Evaluation Criteria Categories

Ecological Importance	(30 points)
Public Support and Involvement	(25 points)
Technical Merit and Readiness	(30 points)
Cost Justification	(15 points)

A) ECOLOGICAL IMPORTANCE (30 pts.) - An ideal project will restore natural ecosystem processes, structures and services. Preferably, the project will result in site conditions where the composition and configuration of the landscape reflect historical complexity and is resilient to current and future development impacts, and will provide highly valued habitat to target species.

1) Will the project provide long-term ecosystem benefits? Describe how your project will maintain existing ecosystem services or protect intact ecosystem processes or restores the sources of degradation to ecosystem processes.

> **Points Possible**
> **0-5 Points**

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- Restores or protects ecosystem processes or services.
- Protects intact areas.
- Addresses priority restoration or protection needs (i.e. degradation or future risk) within a site.
- Proposed action(s) **addresses** a PSNERP strategy for that process unit Cereghino et. al. 2012.

2) Will the site be resilient to future degradation? The project results in a functioning site that restores ecosystem dynamics and connectivity and if not delivered fully by the project action; the proposal describes how incremental work (through future actions of which this project contributes to) will restore a high level of ecosystem complexity at the site (climate change will be addressed in a later category).

> **Points Possible**
> **0-5 Points**

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- Expected future condition of target ecosystem state is clearly described including predicted changes over time. A full range of ecosystem components (Shipman 2008) or conditions (Cereghino et al 2012) will increasingly provide historical ecosystem services over time.
- Rare shoreform types (e.g. lost barrier estuaries, oligohaline and freshwater tidal marsh), and relatively rare ecosystem components (e.g. stream deltas) are recovered over time.
- Proposed actions will result in contiguous patches of habitat that are hydrologically connected in a manner sustainable by natural processes, and open to unconstrained river and/or tidal processes.
- Adjacent areas support the function of the site (e.g. well-vegetated buffers deliver clean, cold water; up-drift bluffs provide sediment etc.).
- If incremental restoration is proposed, future restoration is feasible and designs do not preclude full restoration in the future.

3) Do the surrounding conditions support the project? The project approach is 1) responsive to potential risks of intense or complex site degradation, 2) potential future impacts from population growth and 3) demonstrates a preference for work where, over time, historical processes will be restored or protected at the scale of the process unit or 'nearshore ecosystem site' *(Note: climate change should be addressed in section titled "Climate Change").*

> **Points Possible**
> **0-10 Points**

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices

Ideal projects have some or all of the following

- The project will protect or restore an ecosystem component or landform that is critical for increasing the integrity of the region, compared to historical composition.
- Project actions are consistent with the scientific record, respond to risks identified in Cereghino et al. 2012 and utilize local assessments.
- Upland and watershed modifications do not substantially limit the ability of the proposed actions to provide intended benefits and/or such modifications are or will be addressed through the project design.
- The potential for future development within and adjacent to the site is explicitly explored. The processes and services of the site will be resilient to anticipated change. Cereghino et al. (2012) provides a range of risk metrics following Simenstad et al. (2011) and Bolte & Vache (2010).

Sample questions to consider in this section

- What are the known or anticipated (current and future) impacts to the project site from the surrounding landscape conditions?
- What are the known or anticipated (current and future) benefits to the project site from the surrounding landscape conditions?
- What are the historical conditions in and around the site? How does the restoration

outcome improve upon the degraded conditions?

4) Does the proposal achieve goals listed in your geographic area's MRC Strategic Plan or Lead Entity/LIO Strategic Plan if there is no MRC in your area? List the goal(s) and describe how your project meets the goal(s) and objectives of that Strategic Plan.

> **Points Possible
> 0-5 Points**

5) Does it provide ecosystem benefits that society places value on? – The project site(s) will restore or protect ecological services as compared to other similar landforms, based on an identified and accurately cited assessment.

> **Points Possible
> 0-5 Points**

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- Proposed actions restore or protect ecosystems that have experienced significant loss in size or quantity in Puget Sound or sub-basin or that contain rare, vulnerable or ecologically important species or resources (e.g. PSP indicators: estuarine wetland, eelgrass meadow, seabirds, unarmored sediment sources, forage fish, and Chinook salmon; state or federal listed species, WDFW's priority habitats and species).
- Proposed action is logically linked to a change in habitat and other conditions that provide direct benefits for species of concern. The mechanism by which habitat change leads to species benefits is described (e.g. increases in tidal wetland area and re-establishment of channel networks is anticipated to increase juvenile salmon carrying capacity; predicted change in sediment texture and increase in overhanging shoreline vegetation increases forage fish spawning area).
- Proposed actions are clearly identified in regional or species recovery plans.

B) PUBLIC SUPPORT AND INVOLVEMENT (25 pts.) *The project will build community support for protection and restoration, engage the local community and/or encourages valuable partnerships.*

1) Are there social benefits? The project provides benefits in addition to ecological restoration or protection.

> **Points Possible
> 0-10 Points**

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- The project references or provides documentation that the project will deliver multiple benefits to local communities including but not limited to public education or engagement, appropriate low- impact public use, flood hazard mitigation, drainage improvements, or infrastructure upgrades.

2) Are there many stakeholders and partners involved? – The project engages many local and regional partners that will collaboratively support education, technology

> **Points Possible
> 0-15 Points**

transfer, and stakeholder participation.

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- Letters of support indicate a broad and diverse base of support.
- Partners have been identified and specific mechanisms developed to support communications and collaboration relevant to successful completion of ESRP tasks and on-going project stewardship.
- Project is in a demonstrably visible location and proponent has a project communications strategy describing how specific groups of stakeholders will be made aware of project activities and related issues.
- Partners or key stakeholders actively involved in feasibility, design and/or implementation.

C) TECHNICAL MERIT AND READINESS (30 pts.) - *A strong technical and social review of the project is well documented or proposed for the current phase. Work will be done quickly, and the project is being designed to meet a range of contingencies, advance ecological science, and maximize resilience under climate change.*

1) Are the techniques reliable? 1) The project team includes the range of professional skills and experience suited to the scope of the project, ensuring high confidence the project will result in the predicted benefits and 2) the project has been improved by critique from an independent and documented interdisciplinary technical review process.

> **Points Possible
> 0-10 Points**

Evaluation Guidance and Best Practices

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- The project team contains the range of expertise needed to complete proposed actions.
- Proposal references or proposes an independent and well documented external review of project strategies and alternatives. Proposal has identified, by name and affiliation, an interdisciplinary design team that supports the proposed project.
- The project identifies links between ecosystem elements and the processes that maintain them so that the project is likely to have the outcomes described in Ecological Importance (considers ecological context, confidence in predictions, and predictability of the management measures).

Restoration

- Sponsor has engaged key stakeholders and technical experts to identify key uncertainties and constraints regarding project performance. Proposed approach is designed to address the uncertainties and constraints to the extent possible and consider alternative scenarios in the design process. For construction projects, the sponsor has a clearly defined contingency plan to address uncertainties.

2) Have you identified and resolved uncertainty around technical methods and

> **Points Possible
> 0-5 Points** 16

ecological response to actions? 1) The post-construction uncertainties and associated risks have been well defined, 2) a strategy for monitoring and managing uncertainty is defined and 3) opportunities for learning are fully developed and integrated into the project design.

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- Feasibility and design – proposal explicitly lists factors anticipated that may create uncertainty in project outcomes, including impacts from compromises to the original restoration concept, landscape setting, future threats, ongoing human use, and fundamental assumptions about climate change.
- Restoration
  - Projects requesting monitoring funds should have completed a monitoring and adaptive management plan which will be the basis for evaluating requests for monitoring funding.
  - A management strategy, including an appropriate level of qualitative or quantitative monitoring, has been (or will be) developed to monitor the evolution of natural processes and to observe characteristics of the site during and following implementation that are explicitly linked to outcomes.
- Proposal will identify staff responsible for site management including the skills, knowledge, and experience needed for proposed outcomes.

3) Does the project help address climate change issues? The action increases the resilience of both natural and human systems or fosters adaptation to anticipated sea level rise and local climate change.

Points Possible
0-5 Points

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- Proponent demonstrates understanding of how climate change is likely to affect site processes and functions and demonstrates how the information has been considered in the site selection and design process, and monitoring.
- Opportunities to facilitate landward movement of coastal ecosystems subject to dislocation by sea-level rise and other climate change impacts are considered. For example:
  - Beach projects allow for landward migration area of shorelines within the project and sustained sediment supply necessary to adjust beach elevations.
    - Adequate opportunities for landward migration of tidal wetlands are available with the project area.
    - The project design and system conditions allows for adequate and timely delivery of sediments to support marsh accretion within the project area and drift cell.
  - Proposal identifies and addresses potential impacts of the project to adjacent land uses under climate change scenarios.

4) Is the project ready to go? The proposed schedule is reasonable for project phase

Points Possible
0-10 Points

and not likely to be significantly delayed by social controversy or uncertainty over landowner willingness.

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- Proposals will be evaluated for readiness as defined within each of the ESRP status categories.
- Landowner has provided written support for the project.
- Proposed actions are consistent with local land use goals, policies, and regulations.
- There have been documented public communication efforts concerning the project and evidence that the sponsor has taken appropriate steps to prevent or limit controversy that would prevent or substantially delay implementation.
- Budget needs for the proposed phase of project, including matching funds, are secured or pending and likely. A clear strategy is provided for financing necessary additional phases that comprise the whole project.

D) COST JUSTIFICATION (15 pts.) *Ideal projects will have clear budgets that are appropriate for the type of actions proposed in the given location and demonstrate that cost-saving mechanism (design considerations, low-cost partners, diverse funding sources etc.) have been incorporated into the project.*

1) Are actions cost effective for the site? The relationship between expected outcomes and total project cost is appropriate for the project location and landform.

> **Points Possible
> 0-10 Points**

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- Conceptual design and costs are focused on the most relevant management measure(s). Only a limited proportion of funds are focused on supporting management measures.
- Operations and maintenance costs are minimized and cost-savings mechanisms are used (e.g. low cost partners; volunteers, partnerships etc.).
- Non-state funding sources are leveraged to maximize the ecological protection and restoration benefits.

2) Is there a clear and understandable budget? The budget is complete and provides a fair estimate of all elements required for successful implementation of proposed actions.

> **Points Possible
> 0-5 Points**

Ideal projects have some or all of the following:

- The whole project budget is complete, sources of funding are explicit and their status can be clearly discerned.
- Line item costs are clearly described in a budget narrative so that the nature of the costs and the estimation method can be easily discerned.

- Budget narrative describes uncertainties considered when developing the budget. Modest but reasonable contingency (based on specific and identified risks) is built into the budget at the task level.
- Funding partners and contributions reflect the diversity of benefits that will be delivered by the project (e.g. projects addressing drainage or flood control have contributions from agricultural groups or dike districts; if public access is improved, matching funds or in-kind from a user-group included; if salmon recovery project, SRFB dollars included).

APPENDIX C: OTHER RESOURCES

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

ESRP website	http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/esrp.htm
PSNERP Publications	http://www.pugetsoundnearshore.org/technical_reports.html
PSNERP: Change Analysis Geodatabases	http://wagda.lib.washington.edu/data/geography/wa_state/#PSNERP
Puget Sound Partnership- Action Agenda	http://www.psp.wa.gov/action_agenda_center.php
Puget Sound Partnership Salmon Recovery and Watershed Work Plans	http://www.psp.wa.gov/SR_threeyearworkplan.php
The Nature Conservancy Ecoregional Assessment	http://waconservation.org/ecoregionalAssessments.shtml
Puget Sound Nearshore Project Data Site	http://www.psnerp.ekosystem.us/
Habitat Work Schedule	http://www.ekosystem.us
Ecology Oblique Aerial Photography	http://apps.ecy.wa.gov/shorephotos/index.html
WA Dept. of Ecology Coastal Atlas	https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/coastalatlas/
Northwest Straits MRCs	http://www.nwstraits.org/get-involved/mrcs/
Puget Sound Lead Entities	http://www.psp.wa.gov/salmon-lead-entities.php
Local Integrating Organizations	http://www.psp.wa.gov/LIO-overview.php
Communication planning resources	Strategic communications planning template The message box Communicating Science Effectively

CITATIONS

Bolte, J. and K. Vache. 2010. *Envisioning Puget Sound Alternative Futures. Prepared for, the Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project*. Department of Biological & Ecological Engineering, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon, 50 p.

Cereghino, P., J. Toft, C. Simenstad, E. Iverson, S. Campbell, C. Behrens, J. Burke. 2012. *Strategies for nearshore protection and restoration in Puget Sound. Puget Sound Nearshore Report No. 2012-01*. Published by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle, Washington.

Clancy, M., I. Logan, J. Lowe, J. Johannessen, A.Maclennan, F.B. Van Cleve, J. Dillon, B. Lyons, R. Carman, P. Cereghino, B. Barnard, C. Tanner, D. Myers, R. Clark, J. White, C.A. Simenstad, M. Gilmer, and N. Chin. 2009. *Management measures for protecting and restoring the Puget Sound nearshore. Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership Report No. 2009-01*. Published by Seattle District U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle Washington, and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia WA.

Fresh, K. L., M. Dethier, C. Simenstad, M. Logsdon, H. Shipman, C. Tanner, T. Leschine, T. Mumford, G. Gelfenbaum, R. Shuman, and J. Newton. 2011. *Implications of observed anthropogenic changes to nearshore ecosystems in Puget Sound. Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Restoration Project Report No. 2011-03*. Published by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington.

Shipman, H. 2008. *A geomorphic classification of Puget Sound nearshore landforms. Puget Sound Nearshore Partnership Report No. 2008-01.* Published by Seattle District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle, Washington.

Simenstad, C., M. Ramirez, J. Burke, M. Logsdon, H. Shipman, C. Tanner, J. Toft, B. Craig, C. Davis, J. Fung, P. Bloch, K. Fresh, D. Myers, E. Iverson, A. Bailey, P Schlenger, C. Kiblinger, P. Myre, W. Gertsel, and A. MacLennan. 2011.
Historical change of Puget Sound shorelines: Puget Sound Nearshore Ecosystem Project Change Analysis. Puget Sound Nearshore Report No. 2011-01. Published by Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Olympia, Washington, and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Seattle, Washington.