

Summary of Criteria for Scoring 2023 Flood Reduction Grant Applications

The highest potential score is 100 for general Flood Reduction applications and 125 for projects fitting in the three other categories. General Flood Reduction applications will be scored on sections 1, 3 and 4 of this scoring summary sheet. Urban Streams, Culvert Replacements/Fish Passage and Coastal Erosion/Coastal Flooding applications will be scored on all sections in this scoring summary sheet. Projects will be compared only within the category in which they best fit. The scoring is broken down to match the sections in the online application as follows:

Section 1 – Flood Reduction Benefits:

Problem Summary/Benefits to Flood Reduction – 20 points

- The problem the project will address is clearly defined and the reasons for undertaking the project now are clear and reasonable.
- The flooding problem that is addressed is significant or potentially significant. There is currently a flooding problem, or there is the potential for significant failure/flooding, that is now or will be affecting property or infrastructure.
- The problem constrains access and/or has current or future economic impacts that may result in the loss of business, loss of property or high maintenance costs.

Expected Outcomes – 10 points

- The near-term outcomes correct a flooding problem or reduce flooding risk in a measurable or demonstrable way.
- The long-term outcomes ensue from the near-term outcomes over time in a logical and credible way even if the outcomes are less tangible to demonstrate.
- The applicants adequately describe how the project could contribute to improving functions at the larger landscape level beyond the boundaries of the project site.

Section 2 – Category-Specific Criteria

Urban Streams – 25 points

- The application clearly states in which urban growth area in King County the project is located.
- The potential benefits to an urban stream are clearly described in terms of flow control, water quality improvements, and/or habitat improvements.

Culvert Replacement/Fish Passage – 25 points

- The project will restore fish passage by replacing and/or removing culverts or other instream structures that have been identified as partial or complete barriers to fish passage.
- Clearly describes the amount and type of potential fish habitat upstream to the next known fish passage barrier and to the upstream limit of potential fish habitat regardless of intervening man-made fish passage barriers (but not including habitat upstream of the next natural fish passage barrier).
- The project reflects a coordinated effort to restore fish passage in the watershed (i.e., the project is addressed in a state, county, city, or WRIA subbasin plan or priority list).
- Demonstrates that the project has been or will be designed to meet or exceed minimum fish passage standards per Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife requirements (e.g., the 2013 WDFW Water Crossing Design Guidelines).

Coastal Erosion/Coastal Flooding – 25 points

- The project focuses on reducing flooding and increasing resiliency to sea level rise in coastal flood zones.
- If modifications to existing shoreline stabilization are proposed, the project will reduce the existing ecological impacts through 'soft' armoring approaches and will not result in any increase in hard armored shoreline such as bulkheads, seawalls, or revetments.
- If acquisition is proposed, the project includes demolition or relocation of structures to areas that are outside of the mapped flood zone to reduce flood risks.
- The parcel where the project is located is in a mapped flood zone (map should be uploaded) along the Puget Sound shoreline of King County.

Section 3: Organization Capacity and Implementation Strength

Equity and Environmental Justice – 15 points

- Describes clearly how the project would promote equity and environmental justice.
- Project focuses on people and places where needs are greatest and would increase opportunity for all people, particularly for low-income communities, communities of color, and/or people with limited English proficiency.

Organization Capacity, Including Partners – 10 points

- Project team, including partners, seems to be experienced in carrying out the type of work specified in the project description.
- The project team has the necessary skills in place to proceed promptly upon award.

Project Goals – 10 points

- The project goals are clearly defined.
- They have clearly identified how they will determine whether they met the goals.

Scope of Work – 15 points

- Description of tasks, deliverables and timeline are detailed and reflect the project goals.
- The timeline for the tasks seems achievable.
- Deliverables for each task are clearly defined.

Permits and Permissions – 5 points

- The applicant seems clear as to what permits and authorizations they may need for the project.
- If the applicant does not own the project site, letters of support from the landowner are attached.

Section 4: Budget

Budget – 15 points

- Budget seems reasonable and is consistent with and appropriate for the project scope.
- Budget breakdown is detailed and cost basis documentation is thorough.
- Leverage amount seems reasonable relative to the grant amount.

Subsequent to Scoring: The geographic distribution of projects will be considered as an un-scored factor in developing the final grant award list.