

Priority 2 Draft Evaluation Criteria

Karen Carney, Abt Associates

September 20, 2023

Screening Criteria

Screening Criteria

- 1.1 Project nexus to restoration injury – must restore injured resources
- 1.2 Feasibility – proposal similar to other successful projects, technical merit, adequacy of funding, etc.
- 1.3 Public health and safety – cannot threaten
- 1.4 Consistency with existing laws, policies, and regulations – must be consistent
- 1.5 Project additionality – must not be required by existing laws or policies, or have other existing dedicated funding or obvious alternative sources of funding
- 1.6 (TENTATIVE) Would not include activities that would increase PFAS-related risks to wildlife or people
 - a. Only relevant if PFAS consideration Option 1 is chosen
- 1.7 (TENTATIVE) Would not involve PFAS-sensitive activities in areas with a high-risk of PFAS related wildlife injuries or fish consumption related human health impacts
 - a. Only relevant if PFAS consideration Option 3 is chosen

Evaluation Criteria

2.1 Project Implementation

- 2.1.1 Benefits to injured resources and services – projects with central focus on key resources/services injured by 3M PFAS would be preferred
- 2.1.2 Cost effectiveness – for projects that provide same or very similar benefits, least costly would be preferred
- 2.1.3 Consistency of the project with local, county and regional planning – projects supported by planning efforts would be favored
- 2.1.4 Minimizes potential for additional wildlife injury and fish consumption related human health risks – least risk for wildlife and people would be favored
- 2.1.5 Minimizes adverse community impacts – projects that minimize such impacts would be preferred

Evaluation Criteria, ct'd

2.1 Project Implementation, ct'd.

2.1.6 Community engagement – substantial engagement would be favored

2.1.7 Benefits multiple municipalities – benefits to multiple municipalities would be favored

2.1.8 Equity and environmental justice – projects with benefits to populations experiencing inequities and/or disparities would be favored

2.1.9 Public access – projects that restore resources and services that would be available for public use would be favored

2.1.10 Self-sustaining benefits – little maintenance or management needed to secure benefits would be favored

Evaluation Criteria ct'd

2.2 Measurement and Monitoring

2.2.1 Monitoring plans – robust monitoring would be favored

2.2.2 Measurability of project benefits – quantitative measurements of benefits would be favored

2.3 Matching Funds

2.3.1 Matching/leveraging funding – projects that leverage funding would be favored

Discussion