

2018 Distinguished Project Award – Instructions to Applicants

Nominations are now open for the Fish Passage 2018 Project Award. The nomination form will be closed on **30th June 2018**.

The Fisheries Engineering Committee Project Award Task Group is seeking submissions for projects that use innovation and technical excellence to achieve ecological gain for fish passage, river connectivity and improved habitat for endangered and native species.

An ideal project for the award would be small to medium in size that exemplifies success and inspires greater application of fish passage restoration although both an award to a large project and a smaller project may be considered. Projects that have been shared widely in professional papers or conference presentations are encouraged. Self-nomination is encouraged.

Award Selection Evaluation Criteria

Each nominated project will be evaluated with the following criteria:

- Monitoring and evaluation - Monitoring report / findings and data are required for submittal. Telemetry, fish trapping, physical observations counts, or other monitoring techniques should be used as the basis of the findings. The monitoring report should describe methods and analysis of both pre and post construction.
- Ecological gain for passage and habitat for endangered and native species
- Innovation and technical excellence
- Stakeholder collaboration and community based support
- Education and public involvement
- Effective application of resources (financial and matching)
- Implementation according to design intent and adaptive to field conditions
- Inspirational value

The project award task group will use these criteria to score and rank the projects following the **attached matrix**. Priority will be given to projects that have demonstrated effectiveness and fulfilment of restoration goals, as illuminated by a well-designed monitoring plan and system. Please refer to the attached matrix of the evaluation criteria noting the applicable weighting and the scoring basis descriptions with examples of low and high ranking for each criteria.

Project Nomination Submission

Follow the form field prompts. Nominations must be submitted before **30th June 2018**. Submissions should detail how implementation, monitoring, evaluation and financial resources were implemented and used, and the effect on education, public involvement, inspirational value, effective application of resources (financial and matching), stakeholder collaboration and community based support. The project description on the nomination form should minimally include:

- Watershed location and ecological zone of improvements
- Extents of species and ecological zones benefited
- Summary of the stakeholders involved and the collaboration process that was used across diverse groups (federal, state, local, non-profit, communities)
- Synopsis of research, planning, design, and implementation.
- Monitoring plan & report with supporting data (including any reports, peer-reviewed papers, etc.)
- Description of ecological success to date and probable trajectory
- Project cost (if possible)
- Time and resources to monitor and evaluate if the project is meeting its stated goals

Notification

The winning project(s) will be selected by the EWRI-AFS Joint Committee on Fisheries Engineering and Science and notified at the end of July 2018 or soon thereafter. The awarded project(s) and leaders will receive official recognition, tokens of appreciation, and presentation of the award at the Fish Passage 2018 conference at Albury, NSW (Australia). The winning project will also be listed on the Fish Passage Conference website and will have the opportunity to present their work through the ASCE-EWRI/AFS-BES Joint Committee on Fisheries Engineering and Science Webinar Series in 2019. It is requested that at least one representative of the winning project(s) be present to receive the award at the conference banquet and give a short presentation of the project during the conference.

Award Selection Evaluation Criteria Scoring Matrix

		BASIS FOR SCORING			
	Criteria	Weight	Description	<i>examples for ranking</i>	
				low	high
1	Monitoring and Evaluation - Implementation	14	Does the project implement monitoring and/or evaluation that is linked to the goals of the project? Are financial resources dedicated to implementing the plan?	One year of visual observations at a single location	Multi-year tagging study that quantifies entry and passage rate through the structure or restored reach
2	Monitoring and Evaluation - Performance	17	Actually works--results of the monitoring	20% passage or erosion issues	Great passage with low delay, robust endurance to environmental stressors
3	Monitoring and Evaluation - Reporting	7	Shared widely (conference presentations, etc.)	In-house report or less	Presented at meetings (8); Peer-reviewed pub (10)
4	Ecological gain for passage and habitat for endangered and native species	15	Lower rating for lesser extent and less threatened native species or ecosystem, higher for critically endangered and restoration of significant habitat	100 feet upstream for non-endangered steelhead	Many miles for endangered salmonids and other species
5	Innovation and technical excellence	15	Were unique and innovative technologies or studies used to develop and implement a solution	Standard solutions	Something new, adaptive, and effective, research based

6	Stakeholder collaboration and community based support	5	Ranking based on range from one stakeholder to 3 or more stakeholders coordinating for planning, design and financing	One stakeholder	Multiple and diverse (local, state, federal, private, community)
7	Education and public involvement	8	Level of public outreach, involvement of students, stake holder meetings and coordination	One public meeting	Ongoing community involvement and future investment
8	Effective application of resources (financial and matching)	5	Leveraging of funding and/or other resources (e.g. materials, labor) to improve reduce cost/improve value	Limited funding and gain for cost	Very cost effective, use of local materials and labor, well funded
9	Implementation according to design intent and adaptive to field conditions	7	Low ranking if there were glitches and unmet challenges versus impeccable implementation according to design, planning, and field surprises	Drop heights/slope not to par, monitor glitches	Highly compliant to design and planning, work beyond expectation (more native plants, channel habitat)
10	Inspirational value	7	Did the project enroll stake holders and others to continue efforts beyond the project expectations or for other projects? Is it a model for restoration?	Standard fare for typical culvert removal	Paragon of projects and testimonials

Weight total

100