

---

# UPPER COLUMBIA PRE-PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

---



**UCRTT**  
UPPER COLUMBIA  
REGIONAL  
TECHNICAL TEAM

---

**January 2022**

# Table of Contents

<b>Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Scoring Criteria .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Restoration Projects .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Protection Projects .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Assessment Projects .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Design Projects .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Monitoring Projects .....</b>	<b>19</b>

# Introduction

The Upper Columbia Regional Technical Team (UCRTT) has developed criteria for evaluating pre-proposals submitted as part of the Salmon Recovery Funding Board (SRFB) and other regional funding processes. This early evaluation benefits both the reviewers and project sponsors. That is, reviewers have a capacity to evaluate multiple applications, and early feedback from reviewers provides project sponsors information on the competitiveness of their applications. Thus, reviewers are not overburdened reviewing full applications that are not competitive within a funding cycle and project sponsors can spend more time and resources on developing competitive applications. Importantly, this process will only be used when the funding request across all proposed projects exceeds the SRFB funds available within a funding cycle.

In some funding cycles, project sponsors are required to submit pre-proposals of their proposed projects before they submit full project applications. Pre-proposals should include project objectives, a brief description of the proposed project and its size (footprint), the location of the project, limiting factors addressed, costs, and landowner support. Based on this information, the RTT and CAC can use simplified evaluation criteria to determine if a proposed project will be competitive within the funding cycle and provide early feedback to sponsors so that they can improve their proposal moving forward. What follows is a description of the criteria the RTT will use to evaluate pre-proposals of proposed projects within a funding cycle.

## Scoring Criteria

Like the evaluation of full applications, the RTT uses specific criteria to evaluate each project type (restoration, protection, assessment, design, and monitoring). Unlike the evaluation of full applications, only a few criteria are used to determine if a proposed project will be competitive within a funding cycle. The criteria used to evaluate pre-proposals determine whether the proposed project is placed within an important assessment unit, addresses important limiting factors or protects high-quality habitat, enhances or protects natural processes, and improves freshwater survival and/or capacity. Below we describe the criteria used to evaluate pre-proposals for each project type.

# Restoration Projects

## 1. Address Primary Limiting Factors

- a) Does the proposed restoration project reduce the effects of **primary** limiting factors (as identified in the Prioritization Strategy; [Prioritization Portal](#)) at the reach<sup>1</sup> scale? (25% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Proposed restoration actions must address **primary** factors limiting the freshwater survival and/or distribution of fish species. Projects that address more than one limiting factor, or fully rectify a single limiting factor, achieve the highest scores.

Sequencing of projects also affects scoring. That is, projects that address limiting factors that are unlikely to affect freshwater survival or distribution without first correcting other factors would achieve relatively low scores, unless the proposed sequencing is justified by extenuating circumstances.

Limiting factor ranks are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = project does not address ranked limiting factor at the *reach* scale.
  - 1-6 = project provides some level of improvement to ranked limiting factor(s) (rated unacceptable or at-risk at the *reach* scale).
  - 7 = project fully rectifies a Rank 1 limiting factor(s) at the *reach* scale.

## 2. Location and Scale of the Restoration Project

- a) Is the proposed restoration project sited within an important “assessment unit” for restoration? (16% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Streams vary in intrinsic potential and habitat quantity and quality because of differences in geology, geomorphology, valley width, elevation, stream size, gradient, and other factors. The RTT incorporated intrinsic potential and other information in identifying high priority assessment units for restoration within each sub-basin (see Step 1 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; [Prioritization Strategy](#)). Projects that improve habitat quantity and quality within high priority assessments units, or provide access to

---

<sup>1</sup> A reach is one of the nested hierarchical subdivisions of a drainage network. It is smaller than a valley segment and larger than a channel unit. A reach is classified by the geomorphic attributes of valley confinement, bed material, channel geometry, slope, and assemblages of geomorphic units (e.g., pool, riffle, etc.). Reaches in the Upper Columbia are set to be 1-4 km long and are identified in the Prioritization Strategy.

such habitat, will achieve the highest scores. Scores are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = Not a priority.
  - 1 = Tier 3 Lower Priority.
  - 4 = Tier 2 Moderate Priority.
  - 7 = Tier 1 High Priority.
  - If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, **the RTT will use the higher of the AU prioritization scores.**

b) Is the proposed restoration project sited within an important “reach” within a priority assessment unit? (9% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Because reaches vary in habitat quality, habitat quantity, connectivity, and geomorphology, they do not have equal restoration potential. Therefore, restoration actions should occur first in reaches with the highest potential for restoration. The RTT has incorporated several factors in identifying high-priority reaches for restoration within assessment units (see Step 2 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; [Prioritization Strategy](#)). Projects that improve habitat quantity and quality within high-priority reaches, or provide access to such habitat, will achieve the highest scores. Scores are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = Unranked Reach.
  - 1 = Rank 3 Reach.
  - 4 = Rank 2 Reach.
  - 7 = Rank 1 Reach.
  - If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, **the RTT will use the higher of the Reach prioritization scores.**

### 3. Temporal Effect of Proposed Restoration Action

a) Does the proposed project promote natural stream/watershed processes that are consistent with the geomorphology of the stream? (25% of total score)

- **Rationale:** The RTT defines *natural stream/watershed processes* as dynamic processes affecting habitat form and function at multiple spatial and temporal scales. Floodplain connectivity, complex instream structure, absence of barriers, and large intact riparian zones are all features of natural stream/watershed processes. As discussed within the Biological Strategy, “process-based restoration” refers to projects that will result in long-term changes to natural watershed and fluvial processes. Projects such as riparian plantings, increasing flows, barrier removal, and floodplain and wetland reconnections are all examples of projects that restore natural processes.
- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = project does not promote watershed processes.
  - 1-6 = project improves intermediate levels of watershed processes (some level of restoration of process occurs (or the probability is high) at the *reach* scale).
  - 7 = project fully restores watershed processes at the *reach* scale.

#### 4. Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity

- a) Will the project increase freshwater survival and/or capacity for focal species and life stages at the **reach** scale? (25% of total score)
- **Rationale:** Habitat restoration projects are implemented to increase freshwater survival, increase capacity, and/or expand the distribution of focal fish species. Therefore, it is important to assess the effects of restoration actions on pre-spawn survival, egg-smolt survival, and spawner distribution. These factors are evaluated at the **reach** scale. Species and life stage priorities are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).
  - **Scoring:**
    - 0 = no benefit to freshwater survival, capacity, and/or distribution of focal species and life stages at the *reach* scale.
    - 1-6 = intermediate increase in survival, capacity, and/or distribution of focal species and priority life stages at the *reach* scale.
    - 7 = highest possible benefit to survival, capacity, and/or distribution of focal species and high priority life stages at the *reach* scale.

## Restoration Project Scoring Sheet

Project Name:					
Reviewer:			Date:		
Criteria	Question	Potential Score	Weighting factor	Total Maximum Potential Score	RTT Score (1-7)
<b>Address Primary Limiting Factors</b>	Does the proposed restoration project reduce the effects of <b>primary</b> limiting factors (as identified in the Prioritization Strategy) at the reach scale?	7	3.57	25	
<b>Location and Scale of the Restoration Project</b>	Is the proposed restoration project sited within an important “assessment unit” for restoration?	7	2.29	16	
	Is the proposed restoration project sited within an important “reach” within a priority assessment unit?	7	1.29	9	
<b>Temporal Effect of Proposed Restoration Action</b>	Does the project promote natural stream/watershed processes that are consistent with the geomorphology of the stream?	7	3.57	25	
<b>Benefits to Freshwater Survival or capacity</b>	Will the project increase freshwater survival and/or capacity for focal species and life stages at the reach scale?	7	3.57	25	
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>35</b>		<b>100</b>	

# Protection Projects

## 1. Placement of Protection Project

- a) Is the proposed protection project sited within an important “assessment unit” for protection? (16% of total score)
- **Rationale:** Streams vary in intrinsic potential and habitat quantity and quality because of differences in geology, geomorphology, valley width, elevation, stream size, gradient, and other factors. The RTT incorporated intrinsic potential and other information in identifying high priority assessment units for protection within each sub-basin (see Step 1 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; [Prioritization Strategy](#)). Projects that protect high-quality habitat within priority assessments units will achieve the highest scores. Scores are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).
  - **Scoring:**
    - 0 = Not a priority.
    - 1 = Tier 3 Lower Priority.
    - 4 = Tier 2 Moderate Priority.
    - 7 = Tier 1 High Priority.
    - If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, **the RTT will use the higher of the AU prioritization scores.**
- b) Is the proposed protection project sited within an important “reach” within a priority assessment unit? (9% of total score)
- **Rationale:** Because reaches vary in habitat quality, habitat quantity, connectivity, and geomorphology, they do not have equal protection value. Therefore, protection actions should occur first in reaches with the highest protection value. The RTT has incorporated several factors in identifying high-priority reaches for protection within assessment units (see Step 2 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; [Prioritization Strategy](#)). Projects that protect habitat quantity and quality within high-priority reaches will achieve the highest scores. Scores are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).
  - **Scoring:**
    - 0 = Unranked Reach.
    - 1 = Rank 3 Reach.

- 4 = Rank 2 Reach.
  - 7 = Rank 1 Reach.
  - If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, ***the RTT will use the higher of the Reach prioritization scores.***
- c) Will the proposed project protect watershed processes or important high-quality habitat? (25% of total score)
- **Rationale:** Large parcels of high-quality riparian/floodplain habitat may facilitate the full expression of watershed processes. In reaches with predominantly dysfunctional habitat, disconnected parcels of high-quality riparian/floodplain habitat can serve as important strongholds for biological and physical processes. Therefore, the importance of protecting a given parcel depends on the context of the reach or watershed condition. Examples of areas that are important to protect are tributary junctions, parcels that contain multiple channels and side channels, areas that offer cold-water refugia, mature riparian areas for large wood recruitment, major spawning areas, and connected floodplains.
  - **Scoring:**
    - 0 = project does not protect important processes or is not an important stronghold.
    - 1-6 = project protects parcels that facilitate watershed processes to some degree or parcels where processes can be restored or are habitat strongholds.
    - 7 = project protects an important parcel that contains important watershed process(es) or is an important habitat stronghold.

## 2. Threats

- a) How imminent is the threat of habitat degradation to the proposed land if the project is not implemented? (25% of total score)
- **Rationale:** Because salmon recovery funds are limited, the most pressing concerns need to be addressed first. When evaluating proposals, it is necessary to predict the extent to which a project will change habitat conditions and assess the significance of that change to fish populations. Therefore, to evaluate a habitat protection project, one must have a reasonable basis for comparing what would happen with and without the project. The ability to predict the fate of a proposed parcel of land for protection or easement is difficult but improved when informed by knowledge of the intentions of the present landowner, market conditions, and local critical areas and zoning laws, among others. Scoring protection projects by default as if all extant

habitat values will be lost but for the project would substantially and artificially inflate the value of these projects as compared to restoration projects.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = No clear threat of habitat degradation exists at this time (e.g., what might or could happen is the only threat).
  - 1-6 = The threat to high-quality habitat is not imminent, but the project proponent makes a compelling argument that this protection opportunity will not exist in the future and/or is required for restoration to occur.
  - 7 = There is a demonstrated imminent threat to the property that could lead to loss of high-quality habitat.

### 3. Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity

a) What would be the anticipated loss in freshwater survival and capacity at the **reach** scale and/or distribution of focal species and priority life stages if the proposed area was developed (i.e., what habitat values would be lost and to what degree would that loss reduce freshwater survival and/or distribution of focal species and life stages at the reach scale)? *(25% of total score)*

- **Rationale:** Freshwater survival is related to the quality of stream habitat. The loss of high-quality habitat or capacity will result in reduced freshwater survival, abundance, or distribution of focal fish species and priority life stages.
- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = there would be no reduction in freshwater survival, capacity, or distribution if the proposed area is not protected.
  - 1-6 = intermediate reduction in survival or capacity.
  - 7 = there would be a large reduction in freshwater survival, capacity, or distribution if the proposed area is not protected.

## Protection Project Scoring Sheet

Project Name:					
Reviewer:			Date:		
Criteria	Question	Potential Score	Weight	Total Maximum Potential Score	RTT Score (1-7)
<b>Placement of Protection Project</b>	Is the proposed protection project sited within an important “assessment unit” for protection?	7	2.29	16	
	Is the proposed protection project sited within an important “reach” within a priority assessment unit?	7	1.29	9	
	Will the proposed project protect watershed processes or important high-quality habitat?	7	3.57	25	
<b>Threat</b>	How imminent is the threat of habitat degradation to the proposed land if the project is not implemented?	7	3.57	25	
<b>Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity</b>	What would be the anticipated loss in freshwater survival and capacity at the <b>reach</b> scale and/or distribution of focal species and priority life stages if the proposed area was developed (i.e., what habitat values would be lost and to what degree would that loss reduce freshwater survival and/or distribution of focal species and life stages at the reach scale)?	7	3.57	25	
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>35</b>		<b>100</b>	

# Assessment Projects

## 1. Addresses High Priority Data Gaps

- a) Will the proposed assessment address important data gaps ([Data Gaps](#)) that inform prioritization and/or the development of projects? (34% of total score)
- **Rationale:** All proposed assessments should fill important data gaps and/or link directly to restoration or protection actions addressing **primary** factors that limit freshwater production and/or distribution of fish species. Assessment projects that fill critical data gaps in prioritization and/or inform actions that address more than one limiting factor, or fully rectify a single limiting factor at the *reach* scale, will achieve the highest scores. Sequencing will also affect scores.
  - **Scoring:**
    - 0 = assessment will not fill a critical data gap in prioritization, nor will it result in projects that lead to improvement in limiting factor(s) at the *reach* scale.
    - 1-6 = assessment will only partially fill a critical data gap in prioritization, and/or will result in intermediate change in limiting factor(s) (limiting factor(s) will be partially addressed at the *reach* scale).
    - 7 = assessment will completely fill data gaps in Prioritization in Tier 1 AUs and/or will result in projects that fully rectify limiting factor(s) at the *reach* scale.

## 2. Area Covered by Assessment

- a) Is the proposed assessment project sited within an important “assessment unit” for restoration? (34% of total score)
- **Rationale:** Streams vary in intrinsic potential and habitat quantity and quality because of differences in geology, geomorphology, valley width, elevation, stream size, gradient, and other factors. The RTT incorporated intrinsic potential and other information in identifying high-priority assessment units for restoration within each sub-basin (see Step 1 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; [Prioritization Strategy](#)). Projects that improve habitat quantity and quality within high-priority assessments units, or provide access to such habitat, will achieve the highest scores. Scores are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).
  - **Scoring:**

- 0 = Not a priority.
- 1 = Tier 3 Lower Priority.
- 4 = Tier 2 Moderate Priority.
- 7 = Tier 1 High Priority.
- If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, ***the RTT will use the higher of the AU prioritization scores.***

### 3. Methods

- a) Are the methods outlined within the proposed assessment adequate to achieve the stated objectives? (32% of total score)
- **Rationale:** The assessment must clearly describe the methods that will be used to gather and analyze information. The proposal should demonstrate that it is using an accepted approach (i.e., the RTT Reach Assessment Guidance document). If it is innovative, the proposal should discuss how the methods will achieve the stated objectives of the assessment and demonstrate the benefits of the methods relative to the [RTT Reach Assessment Guidance](#).
  - **Scoring:**
    - 0 = the methods are not adequate (employs questionable methods or practices or those not proven to be effective) to achieve the stated objectives.
    - 1-6 = intermediate (methods need substantial changes (uses methods where results are incomplete) to achieve stated objectives (1 point), or a few changes (employs experimental methods with well-developed rationale and experimental design; 6 points)).
    - 7 = the methods are adequate (employs methods described in the RTT Reach Assessment Guidance document) to achieve the stated objectives.

## Assessment Project Scoring Sheet

<b>Project Name:</b>					
<b>Reviewer:</b>			<b>Date:</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Potential Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Total Potential Score</b>	<b>RTT Score (1-7)</b>
<b>Addresses High Priority Data Gaps</b>	Will the proposed assessment inform the development of projects that reduce the effects of <b>primary</b> limiting factors at the <b>reach</b> scale (as identified in the Prioritization Strategy)?	7	4.85	34	
<b>Area Covered by Assessment</b>	Is the proposed assessment project sited within an important assessment unit for restoration?	7	4.85	34	
<b>Methods</b>	Are the methods outlined within the proposed assessment adequate to achieve the stated objectives?	7	4.57	32	
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>21</b>		<b>100</b>	

# Design Projects

## 1) Address Primary Limiting Factors

- a) Will the proposed design lead to development of projects that will reduce the effects of **primary** limiting factors at the **reach** scale (as identified in the Prioritization Strategy; [Prioritization Portal](#))? (25% of total score)

- **Rationale:** All designs proposed should link directly to restoration or protection actions addressing **primary** limiting factors that limit freshwater survival and/or distribution of fish species at the *reach* scale. Design projects with a direct linkage to development of actions addressing more than one important limiting factor, or fully rectifying a single limiting factor, achieve the highest scores. Sequencing also affects scores.

Limiting factor ranks are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = design will not address ranked limiting factor(s) at the *reach* scale.
  - 1-6 = design will provide some level of improvement to ranked limiting factor(s) (rated unacceptable or at-risk at the *reach* scale).
  - 7 = design will fully rectify Rank 1 limiting factor(s) at the *reach* scale.

## 2) Area Covered by Design

- a) Is the proposed project (created from the design) sited within an important “assessment unit” for restoration? (16% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Streams vary in intrinsic potential and habitat quantity and quality because of differences in geology, geomorphology, valley width, elevation, stream size, gradient, and other factors. The RTT incorporated intrinsic potential and other information in identifying high-priority assessment units for restoration within each sub-basin (see Step 1 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; [Prioritization Strategy](#)). Design projects that improve habitat quantity and quality within high-priority assessments units, or provide access to such habitat, will achieve the highest scores. Scores are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = Not a priority.
  - 1 = Tier 3 Lower Priority.

- 4 = Tier 2 Moderate Priority.
- 7 = Tier 1 High Priority.
- If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, ***the RTT will use the higher of the AU prioritization scores.***

b) Is the proposed project (created from the design) sited within an important “reach” within a priority assessment unit? (9% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Because reaches vary in habitat quality, habitat quantity, connectivity, and geomorphology, they do not have equal restoration potential. Therefore, restoration actions should occur first in reaches with the highest potential for restoration. The RTT has incorporated several factors in identifying high-priority reaches for restoration within assessment units (see Step 2 in the Habitat Action Prioritization Within the Upper Columbia River Basin document; [Prioritization Strategy](#)). Design projects that improve habitat quantity and quality within high-priority reaches, or provide access to such habitat, will achieve the highest scores. Scores are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).
- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = Unranked Reach.
  - 1 = Rank 3 Reach.
  - 4 = Rank 2 Reach.
  - 7 = Rank 1 Reach.
  - If a proposed project targets a combination of spring Chinook salmon, steelhead, and bull trout, ***the RTT will use the higher of the Reach prioritization scores.***

### 3) Temporal Effect of Proposed Restoration Action

a) Will the proposed project (created from the design) promote natural stream/watershed processes that are consistent with the geomorphology of the stream? (25% of total score)

- **Rationale:** The RTT defines *natural stream/watershed processes* as dynamic processes affecting habitat form and function at multiple spatial and temporal scales. Floodplain connectivity, complex instream structure, absence of barriers, and large intact riparian zones are all features of natural stream/watershed processes. As discussed within the Biological Strategy, “process-based restoration” refers to projects that will result in long-term changes to natural watershed and fluvial processes. Projects such as riparian plantings, increasing flows, barrier removal, and

floodplain and wetland reconnections are all examples of projects that restore natural processes.

- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = project does not promote watershed processes (it has very localized effects).
  - 1-6 = project improves intermediate levels of watershed processes (some level of restoration of process occurs (or the probability is high) at the *reach* scale).
  - 7 = project fully restores watershed processes at the *reach* scale.

#### 4) **Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity**

a) Will the proposed project (created from the design) improve freshwater survival or increases capacity for focal species and priority life stages at the **reach** scale? (25% of total score)

- **Rationale:** Habitat restoration projects are implemented to increase freshwater survival, increase capacity, and/or distribution of focal fish species and priority life stages. Therefore, it is important to assess the effects of restoration actions on pre-spawn survival, egg-smolt survival, and spawner distribution. These factors are evaluated at the **reach** scale. Species and life stage priorities are based on outputs in the [Prioritization Portal](#).
- **Scoring:**
  - 0 = no benefit to freshwater survival, capacity, and/or distribution of focal species and life stages at the *reach* scale.
  - 1-6 = intermediate increase in survival, capacity, and/or distribution of focal species and priority life stages at the *reach* scale.
  - 7 = highest possible benefit to survival, capacity, and/or distribution of focal species and high priority life stages at the *reach* scale.

## Design Project Scoring Sheet

<b>Project Name:</b>					
<b>Reviewer:</b>			<b>Date:</b>		
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Question</b>	<b>Potential Score</b>	<b>Weight</b>	<b>Total Potential Score</b>	<b>RTT Score (1-7)</b>
<b>Address Primary Limiting Factors</b>	Will the proposed design lead to development of projects that will reduce the effects of <b>primary</b> limiting factors at the <b>reach</b> scale (as identified in the Prioritization Strategy)?	7	3.57	25	
<b>Area Covered by Design</b>	Is the proposed project (created from the design) sited within an important "assessment unit" for restoration?	7	2.29	16	
	Is the proposed project (created from the design) sited within an important "reach" within a priority assessment unit?	7	1.29	9	
<b>Temporal Effect of Proposed Restoration Action</b>	Will the proposed project (created from the design) promote natural stream/watershed processes that are consistent with the geomorphology of the stream?	7	3.57	25	
<b>Benefits to Freshwater Survival or Capacity</b>	Will the proposed project (created from the design) improve freshwater survival or increases capacity for focal species and priority life stages at the <b>reach</b> scale?	7	3.57	25	
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>28</b>		<b>100</b>	

# Monitoring Projects

## 1. Information Needs

- a) Will the proposed monitoring project fill a Tier 1 data gaps identified in the Upper Columbia Monitoring and Data Management Committee (MaDMC) data gaps list ([Upper Columbia Data Gaps List](#))? (27% of total score)
- **Rationale:** A monitoring project must be designed to address Tier 1 data gaps, as identified by the MaDMC, or new information needs identified by a project sponsor that the RTT agrees are important information needs. Monitoring projects that focus on addressing specific information gaps previously identified by the RTT will score highest.
  - **Scoring:**
    - 0 = monitoring project will not address an important data gap.
    - 1-6 = monitoring project will address a less important data gap or should be expanded to more fully address the Tier 1 data gap.
    - 7 = monitoring project will adequately address a Tier 1 data gap.
- b) What is the scale of inference of the proposed monitoring study? (23% of total score)
- **Rationale:** A monitoring project that provides information at the population or across populations (ESU/DPS) scales will score higher than a monitoring project that provides information at the reach or project scale.
  - **Scoring:**
    - 1 = monitoring project provides information at the site scale (i.e., 10s of meters).
    - 2 = monitoring project provides information at the reach scale (i.e., 100s of meters).
    - 3 = monitoring project provides information at the stream scale (i.e., kilometers).
    - 4 = monitoring project provides information at a watershed scale smaller than AU (e.g., HUC 14).
    - 5 = monitoring project provides information at the AU scale (i.e., HUC 12).
    - 6 = monitoring project provides information at the population scale.
    - 7 = monitoring project provide information across populations (i.e., ESU/DPS scale).

## 2. Purpose of Monitoring Project

- a) Do the objectives of the monitoring proposal complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts? *(23% of total score)*
- **Rationale:** Millions of dollars have been spent on monitoring programs in the Upper Columbia River basin. Future monitoring efforts should be proposed in context with previous and existing monitoring programs. In addition, the proposal should state clearly how it will use information from existing monitoring programs.
  - **Scoring:**
    - 0-2 = proposed monitoring project will not complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts.
    - 3-6 = intermediate; information will complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts to some degree.
    - 7 = proposed monitoring project will completely complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts.

## 3. Methods

- a) Are the methods outlined within the pre-proposal appropriate for addressing the information need? *(27% of total score)*
- **Rationale:** The monitoring proposal must clearly describe the methods (including study design, sampling methodology, and analytical approaches) that will be used to gather and analyze the information. The proposal should demonstrate that it is using accepted methods. If the methods are innovative, the proposal should discuss how the methods will achieve the stated objectives of the monitoring project and demonstrate the benefits of the methods relative to standard methods.
  - **Scoring:**
    - 0 = the methods are not adequate (employs questionable methods or practices or those not proven to be effective) to achieve the stated objectives.
    - 1-6 = intermediate (methods need substantial changes to achieve stated objectives [1 point] or few changes [6 points]).
    - 7 = the methods are adequate to achieve the stated objectives.

## Monitoring Project Scoring Sheet

Project Name:					
Reviewer:			Date:		
Criteria	Question	Potential Score	Weighting Factor	Total Maximum Potential Score	RTT Score (1-7)
Information Needs	Will the proposed monitoring project fill Tier 1 data gaps have identified in the Upper Columbia Monitoring and Data Management Committee data gaps list?	7	1.14	8	
	What is the scale of inference of the proposed monitoring study?	7	1.00	7	
Purpose of Monitoring Project	Do the objectives of the monitoring proposal complement, enhance, or leverage ongoing monitoring efforts?	7	1.00	7	
Methods	Are the methods outlined within the pre-proposal appropriate for addressing the information need?	7	1.14	8	
<b>Grand Total</b>		<b>28</b>		<b>30</b>	