

considerations that could lead to low scores, including potential fatal flaws as identified in the Evaluation Criteria, or scope change recommendations, need to be identified and discussed as early as possible in the grant round process. The HAP Subcommittee and Tacoma Power staff can work with applicants to develop withdrawn proposals for future consideration.

Final Application Review and Funding Recommendation

Applicants must submit a **final application** for funding consideration, including a completed **application checklist**. Applications will be submitted by to Tacoma Power staff by noon on the due date in the grant round calendar. The HAP Subcommittee will review the application, including final scoring and ranking of recommended projects. The HAP Subcommittee will submit a **funding recommendation** to the FTC and will include written justification for all recommendations (to fund and not to fund).

Cowlitz FTC Funding Decision

The FTC will consider the ranked recommendations for habitat and HAP proposals in any given year and determine which proposals should receive funding. The FTC may modify the recommended rankings. The FTC may elect to not fund a recommended project, even if funding is available, based upon the quality and fit of projects to meet CRR Fund implementation goals. **Funding determinations** will be formalized using FTC decision protocols. The funding determination is anticipated in October, with contingency to move to November if needed.

Evaluation

The HAP Subcommittee has developed evaluation criteria for evaluating and ranking project proposals based on technical expertise and the HAP guiding principles. Broadly, these scoring questions fall into the same four categories used for evaluating CRR habitat proposals: Benefits to Fish, Certainty of Success, Cost, and CRR priorities (Figure 2). The scoring questions are specifically included in the application, along with other information to that applicant will use to characterize the proposal. The HAP Subcommittee will use the scoring questions to provide direct feedback to the applicant during the draft evaluation phase without numeric scoring. During the final evaluation phase, the HAP Subcommittee will use the scoring questions to provide written justification for evaluation for the numeric scores for each question.

The scoring questions are intentionally broad and intended to facilitate dialogue between applicants and the HAP Subcommittee during the review process. All scoring questions are applicable to all proposals, but the detail needed to respond and evaluate will likely vary depending on the individual proposal. Applicants are expected to use information from their proposal to explain their responses to the scoring questions. For example, when responding to “Does this project have detrimental impacts for any native fish in the basin”, the applicant should explain their response including any measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts. Similarly, the HAP subcommittee will consider information from the entire application during their evaluation and use the scoring framework to provide feedback or justification, depending on the review phase. Additional guidance for completing the application, including responding to scoring questions, is available as an appendix to this document.

The FTC will review the HAP Subcommittee funding recommendations. The FTC will consider how the project meets the goals of the CRR Program. FTC members will use best professional judgement to evaluate and, if necessary, re-rank projects or elect not to fund projects through a consensus decision-

making process. Scoring will inform the FTC decision-making, and any re-ranking or no-fund decisions will include written justification for that decision.

| Criteria (pass/fail) | | | Pass/Fail |
|--|--|--------------------|---------------------|
| Populations Targeted | Resource project is directed towards listed salmon and steelhead populations originating upstream of the Barrier Dam. | | |
| Geography (extent) | Resource project is located within the following geographic extent: the Cowlitz River mainstem upstream from the confluence of the Toutle River, river mouths of tributaries upstream of the confluence of Toutle River and below the Barrier Dam, and the entire basin upstream of the Barrier Dam. | | |
| Scoring | | | |
| "Low" scores for any given question indicates a fatal flaw (unless noted otherwise) that may make the project ineligible for funding. | | | |
| Category, Question, Bin (H/M/L) | Feedback (draft) / Justification (final) | Point Range | Points Given |
| Benefits to Fish/Certainty of Success (200) | | | |
| <u>What are the benefits to fish species/populations of interest?</u> | | | |
| High Score | | 68-100 | |
| Medium Score | | 34-67 | |
| Low Score | | 0-33 | |
| <u>Does this project have detrimental impacts for any native fish in the basin?</u> | | | |
| High Score | | 68-100 | |
| Medium Score | | 34-67 | |
| Low Score | | 0-33 | |
| Certainty of Success (200) | | | |
| <u>Is the scope and approach of the project reasonable and achievable?</u> | | | |
| High Score | | 136-200 | |
| Medium Score | | 68-135 | |
| Low Score | | 0-67 | |
| Cost (100) | | | |
| <u>Is the cost appropriate for / in alignment with the approach?</u> | | | |
| High Score | | 33-50 | |
| Medium Score | | 17-32 | |
| Low Score | | 0-16 | |
| <u>Are the benefits to recovery appropriate for the cost?</u> | | | |
| High Score | | 33-50 | |
| Medium Score | | 17-32 | |
| Low Score | | 0-16 | |
| CRR Program Criteria and Priorities (100) | | | |
| <u>How well does the project align with the management approaches and policy described in basin documents (e.g., CRR Implementation Plan and Strategy, FHMP and FHMP Transition Plan, HGMP, AOP, Monitoring Plan)?</u> | | | |
| High Score | | 33-50 | |
| Medium Score | | 17-32 | |
| Low Score | | 0-16 | |
| <u>Does the project occur in, or have meaningful benefit for, the proper geographic area?</u> | | | |
| High Score | | 33-50 | |
| Medium Score | | 17-32 | |
| Low Score | | 0-16 | |

Figure 2. The CRR Program HAP scoring worksheet. The feedback/justification column will be filled in by the HAP Subcommittee for each proposal during the draft and final project review, respectively.