



Flow Achievement and Watershed Plan Implementation Grant Program

CONSERVATION APPLICATION EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Applicant City of Camas	Project Name City of Camas Water Conservation
WRIA 28 – Salmon/Washougal	County Clark
Application Number SW – I010	Evaluator Tom Culhane, Dave Nazy, Bob Barwin, Al Josephy, Dave Burdick, Jonathan Kohr, Paul Lariviere

Evaluation Criteria

Sub-Category	Description	Scoring Levels	Points Per Level	Max Possible Score	Score
1. Project Costs					Potential Score: 20
Percentage (of the Entire Project) to Matching Funds or In-Kind Match Available to Proponent	Projects that can secure funding from local or "other" sources should be more attractive to Ecology.	0 to 25% 25 to 50% > 50% Funding provided	0-3 4-6 7-10	10	0
Total Project Cost Per Acre Foot of water saved through this project	Water procured at a lower cost should score higher.	\$0 to 500 \$500-750 \$750-1,000 \$1,000-1,250 \$1,250-1,500 \$1,500-1,750 \$1,750-2,000 > \$2000 per acre foot	10 8 7 5 4 3 1 0	10	0
Total Unweighted Category #1 Score					0

2. Flow and Habitat Benefits					Potential Score: 60
Percent of Low Flow	Total Water saved and added to a stream as a percentage of flow during a critical period	< 5% 5 to 10% 10 to 25% >25	0-2 3-6 7-9 10	10	0
Current Instream Species, Status, and Reach Priority	Consideration of presence and status of salmonids, amphibians, and other aquatic species, and prioritization of this stream reach for instream flow restoration.	Low function and values Medium function and value High function and value	0-3 4-7 8-10	10	0
Fish Access and Passage	Analysis of effectiveness of the project in relation to reach length, need for barrier removal, riffle depth, distance to holding cover and off-channel habitat access.	Neutral or slight improvement Slight to medium improvement Medium to significant improvement	0-3 4-7 8-10	10	0

Potential Future Water Timing and/or Quality Conditions	Consideration of the project's effect on flow timing, as well as degree of water quality improvement that is anticipated as a result of the project.	Flow timing benefits Water quality improvements	0-5 0-5	10	0
Ecological Considerations	Consideration of expected project effectiveness in relation to ecological connectivity, potential effects of climate change, improvement in riparian condition and function.	Harms fish and wildlife (see *) Neutral or slightly helps Improves conditions for fish and wildlife Provides significant benefits for fish and wildlife	0 0-2 3-6 7-10	10	0
Future impacts to Habitat Conditions	Potential effects of future development and land use conversions on project values to fish/wildlife; supplementation potential for fish and wildlife.	Neutral or slightly helps Improves conditions for fish and wildlife related values Provides significant benefits for fish and wildlife related values	0-2 3-6 7-10	10	0

* If the project is anticipated to impose more than short-term negative construction effects on fish/wildlife (i.e. is likely to cause harm to fish and wildlife), the total flow and habitat score will be zero.

Total Unweighted Category #4 Score	0
---	----------

3. Current and Long Term Resources	Potential Score: 20
---	----------------------------

Adequate Resources to Ensure Long-Term Performance of the Proposed Project	This category can be scored with a positive number if there are resources listed to support operations and maintenance and if there is a monitoring program. A zero score if not.	Operation and Maintenance Monitoring Program	0-5 0-5	10	0
Proponent's Readiness to Proceed	This category is based on the applicant's progress in designing and permitting the proposed project prior to filing an application.	Range between No Progress and Approved Construction Documents	0-10	10	0

Total Unweighted Category #5 Score	0
---	----------

Total Unweighted Score for All Categories	0
--	----------

Supplementary Information	Source		Date Obtained
	Site Visit	Other	

Overall Comments:

Application was determined to be ineligible. No instream benefits, net water savings cannot be protected.

Printed Name and Title of Evaluation Member Completing This Scoring Sheet:

Combined consensus score of all evaluators

Signature: _____ Date Completed: March 17, 2009

Scoring and Weighting Table

Categories	Maximum Possible Unweighted Score	Total Unweighted Score	Weighting Factor	Maximum Possible Weighted Score	Weighted Score
1. Project Costs	20	0	3	60	0
2. Fish/Water Quality Benefits	60	0	1	60	0
3. Long Term Resources	20	0	1	20	0
TOTAL SCORE FOR ALL CATEGORIES	100	0		140	0

Date Reviewed for Completeness: April 22, 2009 Dave Burdick, Coordinator