

WRIA 32 Implementation Funds - Selection Criteria

Level I Criteria/Screening:

1. Is the proposed project located in the WRIA 32 planning area?
 - a. Yes – keep
 - b. No – reject
2. Is the proposed project identified in the WRIA 32 Watershed Plan and/or DIP?
 - a. Yes – keep
 - b. No – reject
3. Does the project have at least 10% in matching cost-share funds identified?
 - a. Yes – keep
 - b. No – reject
4. Does the cost proposal (including necessary permits and environmental compliance tasks) total to less than \$85,000?
 - a. Yes – keep
 - b. No – reject
5. Can the proposal be completed by June 15, 2009 with the proposed funding?
 - a. Yes – keep
 - b. No – reject
6. Does the applicant have the ability to execute and properly administer a contract with Walla Walla County?
 - a. Yes – keep
 - b. No – reject

In addition to these Level I criteria all proposed projects will be reviewed by County staff for compliance with County policy, contracting requirements, and potential for risk exposure for the County. Proposals found to not be in compliance with the before mentioned will not be further considered. If a proposal is eliminated by this review they will be notified in writing explaining the reason, but they will not have recourse. For this reason proponents of projects, especially those proposing assessments or projects requiring environmental permitting are encouraged to attend the February 21, 2008 discussion meeting.

Second Level Screening Criteria

The ranking procedure will be as follows:

1. Prior to meeting Watershed Planning Staff research DIP and MSA Scoring category
2. IWG as a group determines categories for remaining criteria
3. Individuals allocate points within that category

Screening Criteria		Scoring Categories		
		Low	Medium	High
Proposal Efficacy - All Projects (50 pts Available)	Watershed Plan DIP	(3) – In Watershed Plan	(6) – In DIP Table 3-3, but not 3-4	(10) – In DIP Table 3-4
	Private/Public landowner partnerships/Community Support	(0-1) Limited - general communication occurred	(2-3) Moderate – Partnerships and Volunteers interested in proposal	(4-5) Significant – Partnerships and Volunteers committing time, money, or in kind.
	Proposal certainty/validity	(0-3) Proposal is based on proven science and will likely not meet objectives	(4-6) Proposal is based on un-proven science but will likely meet objectives	(7-10) Proposal is based on proven science and will likely meet objectives
	MSA vs. mSA	(3) not in an MSA or mSA, but includes fish benefits	(6) mSA (minor spawning area)	(10) MSA (major spawning area) or Imminent Threat
	Professional opinion of proposal merit		Maximum of 15 points	
"On the Ground" Proposal Scoring (50 pts Available)	Multiple significant benefits: water quality, water quantity, habitat improvements, Human dimension benefit	(0-3) Benefit to Water Quality	(4-6) Benefit to Water Quality	(7-10) Benefit to Water Quality
		(0-3) Benefit to Water Quantity	(4-6) Benefit to Water Quantity	(7-10) Benefit to Water Quantity
		(0-3) Benefit to Habitat	(4-6) Benefit to Habitat	(7-10) Benefit to Habitat
		(0-1) Human dimension Benefit	(2-3) Human dimension Benefit	(4-5) Human dimension Benefit
	Long term maintenance and project perpetuity	(0-1) – High level of maintenance including: specialty crews, safety concerns, special procedures	(2-3) Moderate level of maintenance, typical mechanized equipment	(4-5) - No maintenance or no special equipment necessary (visual inspection, shovels, rakes, etc.)
		(0-3) Proposal will result in a project estimated lifespan of 0-5 years	(4-6) Proposal will result in a project estimated lifespan of 6-10 years	(7-10) Proposal will result in a project estimated lifespan of 11+ years. I.E. barrier removal, culvert replacement
Assessment Proposal Scoring (50 pts Available)	Assessment Implementation	(0-8) Full Implementation is likely in 11+ years	9-17) Full Implementation is likely in 6-10 years	(18-25) Full implementation is likely in less than 5 years
		(0) Proposal proponent will not lead implementation	(1-18) Proposal proponent will lead some portion of implementation	(18-25) Proposal proponent will lead implementation

Imminent Threat = SRFB definition “dead fish observed at site” will be used.

Significant = An affect that could be easily quantified or for which there is group consensus that the benefit in question is provided.

Human dimension benefit = A benefit not addressed by water quality, water quantity, or habitat improvements meant to account for the purpose of Watershed Planning to ensure wise use of water resources, protect existing water rights, and provide for economic well-being of citizens and communities (90.82.010RCW).

Estimated lifespan = I.e. Barring acts of nature, how long the project will be functional

Professional Judgment = A scoring criteria recognizing the flexibility needed to recognize proposals that merit special recognition in the eyes of IWG members. Reasons for special recognition are left to the professional consideration of IWG members.