GUIDANCE ON PROJECT SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
***COSCO BUSAN* RECREATIONAL USE RESTORATION PROJECTS**
ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Approximately $9.75 million in settlement funds are available for recreational projects on National Park Service (NPS) lands in Marin and San Francisco Counties that were impacted by the *Cosco Busan* oil spill. Projects to be funded by these settlement funds are intended to compensate the public for the loss of use and enjoyment of beaches, shorelines and other public or natural resources located within NPS park units. NPS park units that were affected by the spill include Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Point Reyes National Seashore and San Francisco Maritime National Historical Park. Projects are expected to focus on shoreline recreation, fishing, boating and other water-based recreation.

The *Cosco Busan* Trustee Council, comprised of representatives of the Department of the Interior (DOI), the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and the California State Lands Commission (CSLC), oversees and manages the use of monies recovered for impacts to the public's natural resources, including final selection of projects and oversight of project implementation. NPS will coordinate the final selection of projects with these other State and federal trustee agencies.

Each National Park Service (NPS) recreation project considered for funding and implementation through the NPS portion of the *Cosco Busan* Oil Spill Settlement will be evaluated using the criteria described below.[i] Projects must meet the Threshold Criteria. NPS projects will be selected for funding and implementation based on how well they meet the Evaluation Criteria.

Criterion from the *Cosco Busan* Oil Spill Final Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan [ii]	**Notes on Application to Recreation**
Threshold Criteria	**If a project does not meet these criteria, it will not be considered further.**
1. Consistency with Trustees' Restoration Goals for Recreational Use	• Does the project address fishing, boating, other water-based recreation activities, and/or shoreline recreation activities? • Does the location or scope of the project benefits fall within the geographic scope of the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA)?[iii]
2. Technical Feasibility	• The project must be technically and procedurally sound.
Evaluation Criteria	
1. Nexus between the Recreational Use Restoration Project and the Impacts of the Spill on Recreation Uses	• To what extent does the project address fishing, boating, other water-based recreation activities, and/or shoreline recreation activities that were affected by the Spill? • To what extent does the project location or geographic scope of project benefits correspond to areas impacted by the spill?

Criterion from the *Cosco Busan* Oil Spill Final Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan [ii]	**Notes on Application to Recreation**
2. Compliance with Applicable Laws	• The NPS will need to be able to meet all applicable laws and obtain all relevant permits. One indicator of a strong project on this criterion would be if all necessary permits have already been obtained or are in the process of being obtained. For projects that are in earlier stages of development, there should be evidence that project permits will be obtainable and a clear process for doing so has been identified. • Projects must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). For projects that are in earlier stages of development, there should be evidence that NEPA requirements are not overly complex and that permits are obtainable within a reasonable time period.
3. Cost-Effectiveness	• Projects that deliver greater recreation benefits relative to their costs will be preferred over projects that provide fewer benefits relative to their costs.
4. Range of Recreational Use Restoration Project Benefits	• Will a broad range of user groups benefit from the project? • Will users from multiple geographic areas benefit from the project? • Is the project accessible to a broad range of individuals within a user group (e.g., can anyone who chooses use the project? is the project universally accessible to people with or without disabilities?) • Are there ancillary benefits to either natural or cultural resources?
5. Time to Provide Benefits	• Projects that begin providing public benefits soon are preferred to projects where the onset of benefits is not expected until further into the future. o For capital improvements, projects that are “shovel ready” will be preferred over those projects that are in the design or pre-design phases. Projects where permitting is completed (or otherwise straightforward) will be preferred to projects that require complex permitting processes that will

Criterion from the *Cosco Busan* Oil Spill Final Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan [ii]	**Notes on Application to Recreation**
	take significant time. o For projects in general, those projects that can articulate how public benefits will begin in the near future will be preferred to projects that cannot.
6. Duration of Project Benefits	• Projects expected to have longer term benefits are favored over those that have short effective project lives. • If long term benefits are expected, is there a mechanism in place to ensure that those benefits are realized?
7. Maintenance and Oversight of Projects	• Does the NPS have the legal authority and organizational capacity to oversee implementation/maintenance? If projects are expected to have long term benefits, does the NPS have the capacity to maintain the project over time?
8. Avoidance of Collateral Injury from Project Implementation	• Project should not benefit one user group to the detriment of others. • Project should generally not have impacts at a level of significance that would require a <u>new</u> Environmental Impact Statement. (Projects with impacts addressed in an existing EIS are acceptable.)
9. Likelihood of Project Success	• Projects should be technically feasible and the NPS should have a high likelihood of successfully implementing the project (e.g., obtaining necessary permits, constructing improvements, carrying out project-related activities). Projects better able to demonstrate these capabilities are preferred. • Projects that have a high likelihood of either drawing new users or improving experience of existing users (once implemented) are preferred.
10. Contribution to a Comprehensive Suite of Projects	• Does the project fit within a total suite of selected restoration projects that address the geographic distribution and types of recreation impacts associated with the spill?
11. Total Project Cost and Accuracy of Estimate	• Estimated project cost should be based upon a comprehensive list of relevant line items necessary to implement the project (e.g., design, permit, implement, monitor,

Criterion from the *Cosco Busan* Oil Spill Final Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan [ii]	**Notes on Application to Recreation**
	maintain, and manage the project). • The NPS will need to be able to demonstrate that project costs are reasonable. • When all other factors are equal, the most cost-effective project is preferred.
12. Effect of Project on Public Health and Safety	• Projects that enhance public health and safety are preferred over projects that do not.
13. Opportunities for Collaboration	• Projects with matching funds are preferred to projects without matching funds.
14. Prevention of Future Injury from the *Cosco Busan* Spill	• A project that addresses ongoing diminishment of recreational use and enjoyment of natural resources that resulted from the spill will be preferred on this criterion.
Supplemental Criteria: These would be considered when appropriate (e.g., in the case of more than one project being equally preferred based upon the above criteria)	
1. Non-Duplication	• Project funding from NPS *Cosco Busan* settlement funds should not displace other funds. • Project should not be duplicating other efforts already ongoing at the same location.
2. Ability to Document Benefits to the Public	• Will there be objective indicators that the project has either increased the number of users or improved the recreational experience of users?
3. Education/Research Value	• Does the project have the potential for public education and outreach?

[i] The *Cosco Busan* Oil Spill setlement identified $9,746,000 for Recreational Use restoration projects on National Park Service lands, including approximately $2,478,000 for Marin County and $7,268,000 for San Francisco County.

[ii] ***Cosco Busan* Oil Spill Final Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan available at:** http://www.dfg.ca.gov/ospr/Science/cosco_busan_spill.aspx

[iii] "Recreation benefits" refers to both (a) the number of users that benefit from a project and (b) the magnitude of the benefit per user.