Appendix D:

Restoration Type Screening Criteria

Proposed Screening Methodology for Bird Projects

The PDARP sets out three goals for bird restoration:

- Restore lost birds by facilitating additional production and/or reduced mortality of injured bird species.
- Restore or protect habitats on which injured birds rely.
- Restore injured birds by species where actions would provide the greatest benefits within geographic ranges that include the Gulf of Mexico.

The restoration approaches for birds include (1) restore and conserve bird nesting and foraging habitat; (2) create, restore, and enhance coastal wetlands; (3) restore and enhance dunes and beaches; (4) create, restore, and enhance barrier and coastal islands and headlands; (5) restore and enhance submerged aquatic vegetation; (6) protect and conserve marine, coastal, estuarine, and riparian habitats; (7) establish or re-establish breeding colonies; and (8) prevent incidental bird mortality.

A. Step 1—Eligibility Screening

As with all the restoration types, project selection begins with identification of projects that have been submitted by the public that have been initially categorized as potentially targeting the restoration type under consideration.

B. Step 2—Initial Project Screening Criteria

Using the set of projects identified as providing bird restoration benefits from the portal project sorting, conduct a general eligibility screening based the AL TIG's goals related to the PDARP restoration type and the following criteria.

1. Project focus is on (i) increased reproduction or decreased mortality for DWH injured species where restoration is not largely complete (wading birds and seabirds including brown pelicans, neotropical migrants); or (ii) filling important information/data gaps for birds in Alabama.
2. Project is more appropriately conducted by the AL TIG than by either the region-wide or open ocean TIGs.
3. Project has a reasonable likelihood of success.
4. Available information is sufficient to permit screening of the project.
5. Project does not fund activities required by local, state or federal law, order, or permit.
6. Project is not already fully funded.
7. Project is not duplicative of other projects on the list.

Projects that receive a "yes" for all the above criteria (1 through 7) would be carried forward to Step 3 below for more project specific consideration.

C. Step 3—Project Specific Screening Considerations

After developing a 'short list' based on the application of the above criteria, each project would be reviewed to evaluate the proposed scope in relation to a variety of project specific considerations. Among the considerations would be:

1. From a restoration or data gap perspective, how significant are the project benefits?
2. Can the project be implemented within the budget available for this restoration plan or is there a source of other funds that can be leveraged in conjunction with NRDA funds available to allow implementation?
3. Is the project cost-effective?
4. Can the project be implemented in a reasonable time frame?
5. Does the project have a significant potential to result in adverse environmental or human health impacts?
6. Are there any other impediments to carrying the project forward as part of the reasonable range of alternatives designated for more detailed OPA and NEPA analysis (e.g., compliance issues)?

Decisions of the AL TIG to move projects from Step 3 to the reasonable range of alternatives are based on a balancing of the considerations outlined above and in the context of the full suite of restoration alternatives being advanced for analysis in the restoration plan. As a result, a project considered in Step 3 may have received a generally favorable review but a decision was made not to move it to the reasonable range of alternatives for this plan. The reason or reasons a project has not been carried forward at this time will be documented in the restoration plan.

D. Step 4—Evaluation of Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Full OPA and NEPA analysis would be performed on the remaining initiatives that have been determined to comprise the reasonable range of alternatives for bird restoration projects. The OPA evaluation would address:

- The cost to carry out the alternative (e.g., cost to benefit).
- The extent to which each alternative is expected to meet the Trustees' goals and objectives in returning the injured natural resources and services to baseline and/or compensating for interim losses.
- The likelihood of success of each alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative will prevent future injury as a result of the incident and avoid collateral injury as a result of implementing the alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative benefits more than one natural resource and/or service.
- The effect of each alternative on public health and safety.

Full NEPA would be conducted for each of the projects that comprise the reasonable range.

Proposed Screening Methodology for Habitats on Federally Managed Lands

For Habitats on Federally Managed Lands (HFML), the PDARP sets our three restoration goals:

- Restore federally managed habitats that were affected by the oil spill and response actions through an integrated portfolio of restoration approaches across a variety of habitats.
- Restore for injuries to federally managed lands by targeting restoration on federal lands where the injuries occurred, while considering approaches that provide resiliency and sustainability.
- Ensure consistency with land management plans for each designated federal land and its purpose by identifying actions that account for the ecological needs of these habitats.

The PDARP highlights seven restoration approaches that are potentially applicable in Alabama for the HFML restoration type, depending upon the actual location of the federally managed lands in the state and the type of habitat where the injury occurred.

1. Create, restore and enhance coastal wetlands.
2. Restore oyster reef habitat.
3. Create, restore, and enhance barrier and coastal islands and headlands.
4. Restore and enhance dunes and beaches.
5. Restore and enhance submerged aquatic vegetation.
6. Protect and conserve marine, coastal, estuarine, and riparian habitats.
7. Promote environmental stewardship, education, and outreach.

Step 1—Eligibility Screening

As with all the restoration types, project selection begins with identification of projects that have been submitted by the public that have been initially categorized as potentially targeting the restoration types under consideration—HFML projects. These are projects located on or in an area that directly and significantly affects the quality of habitat on federally-managed coastal or estuarine lands.

Step 2—Initial Project Screening Criteria

Using the set of projects identified as providing HFML restoration benefits from the portal project sorting, conduct a general eligibility screening based the AL TIG's goals related to the PDARP restoration types and the following criteria.

1. Available information is sufficient to permit screening of the project.
2. Project constitutes an actual project or a specific action, as opposed to a recommendation for a restoration type (e.g., acquisition of a specific parcel of property vs. acquisition of lands in Baldwin County).
3. Project does not fund activities required by local, state or federal law, order, or permit.
4. Project is not already fully funded.
5. Project is not duplicative of other projects on the list.

Projects that receive a "yes" for all the above criteria (1 through 4) would be carried forward to Step 3 below for more project specific screening.

Step 3--Project Specific Screening Considerations

After developing a 'short list' based on the application of the above criteria, each project would be reviewed to evaluate the proposed scope in relation to a variety of project specific considerations. Among the considerations would be:

1. Do the project techniques have a reasonable likelihood of being implemented successfully?
2. Is the project adjacent to land uses that would pose a threat to the success of the project?
3. Is the project consistent with existing management plans (e.g., watershed management plans or species recovery plans) and/or other previous efforts completed by federal, state, local, NGO, or academic entities?
4. Can the project be implemented within the budget available for this restoration plan or is there a source of other funds that can be leveraged in conjunction with NRDA funds available to allow implementation?
5. Is the project cost-effective?
6. Can the project be implemented in a reasonable time frame?
7. Does the project have a significant potential to result in adverse environmental or human health impacts?
8. Are there any other impediments to carrying the project forward as part of the reasonable range of alternatives designated for more detailed OPA and NEPA analysis (e.g., compliance issues)?

Decisions of the AL TIG to move projects from Step 3 to the reasonable range of alternatives are based on a balancing of the considerations outlined above and in the context of the full suite of restoration alternatives being advanced for analysis in the restoration plan. As a result, a project considered in Step 3 may have received a generally favorable review but a decision was made not to move it to the reasonable range of alternatives for this plan. The reason or reasons a project has not been carried forward at this time will be documented in the restoration plan.

Step 4—Evaluation of Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Full OPA and NEPA analysis would be performed on the remaining initiatives that have been determined to comprise the reasonable range of alternatives HFML restoration projects. The OPA evaluation would address:

- The cost to carry out the alternative (e.g., cost to benefit).
- The extent to which each alternative is expected to meet the Trustees' goals and objectives in returning the injured natural resources and services to baseline and/or compensating for interim losses.
- The likelihood of success of each alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative will prevent future injury as a result of the incident and avoid collateral injury as a result of implementing the alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative benefits more than one natural resource and/or service.
- The effect of each alternative on public health and safety.

Full NEPA would be conducted for each of the projects that comprise the reasonable range.

Proposed Screening Methodology for Marine Mammal Projects

The PDARP sets out three goals for marine mammal restoration:

- Implement an integrated portfolio of restoration approaches to restore injured bay, sound and estuary, coastal, shelf, and oceanic marine mammals across the diverse habitats and geographic ranges they occupy.
- Identify and implement restoration activities that mitigate key stressors in order to support resilient populations. Collect and use monitoring information, such as population and health assessments and spatiotemporal distribution information.
- Identify and implement actions that support ecological needs of the stocks; improve resilience to natural stressors; and address direct human-caused threats such as bycatch in commercial fisheries, vessel collisions, noise, industrial activities, illegal feeding and harassment, and hook- and-line fishery interactions.

The PDARP notes that this "restoration portfolio includes approaches designed to decrease and mitigate interactions with commercial and recreational fishing gear, characterize and reduce impacts from noise, reduce harm from industrial activities, reduce illegal feeding and harassment, and increase understanding of causes of marine mammal illness and death."

A. Step 1—Eligibility Screening

As with all the restoration types, project selection begins with identification of projects that have been submitted by the public that have been initially categorized as potentially targeting the restoration type under consideration.

B. Step 2—Initial Project Screening Criteria

Using the set of projects identified as providing marine mammal restoration benefits from the portal project sorting, conduct a general eligibility screening based the AL TIG's goals related to the PDARP restoration type and the following criteria.

1. Project (i) makes direct contributions to reducing mortality or morbidity of Alabama marine mammal populations caused by direct anthropogenic stressors or threats; or (ii) reduces natural stressors or takes other actions that support the ecological needs of marine mammals resulting in increased resilience of Alabama populations; or (iii) plays a significant role in the collection and/or analysis of data that improves our ability to restore marine mammal populations.
2. Project is more appropriately conducted by the AL TIG than by the region-wide or open-ocean TIGs.
3. Project has a reasonable likelihood of success.
4. Available information is sufficient to permit screening of the project.
5. Project does not fund activities required by local, state or federal law, order, or permit.
6. Project is not already fully funded—confirm but generally removed under Step 1.
7. Project is not duplicative of other projects on the list.

Projects that receive a "yes" for all the above criteria (1 through 7) would be carried forward to Step 3 below for more project specific consideration.

C. Step 3--Project Specific Screening Considerations

After developing a 'short list' based on the application of the above criteria, each project would be reviewed to evaluate the proposed scope in relation to a variety of project specific considerations. Among the considerations would be:

1. Can the project be implemented within the budget available for this restoration plan or is there a source of other funds that can be leveraged in conjunction with NRDA funds available to allow implementation?
2. Is the project cost-effective?
3. Can the project be implemented in a reasonable time frame?
4. Does the project have a significant potential to result in adverse environmental or human health impacts?
5. Are there any other impediments to carrying the project forward as part of the reasonable range of alternatives designated for more detailed OPA and NEPA analysis (e.g., compliance issues)?

Decisions of the AL TIG to move projects from Step 3 to the reasonable range of alternatives are based on a balancing of the considerations outlined above and in the context of the full suite of restoration alternatives being advanced for analysis in the restoration plan. As a result, a project considered in Step 3 may have received a generally favorable review but a decision was made not to move it to the reasonable range of alternatives for this plan. The reason or reasons a project has not been carried forward at this time will be documented in the restoration plan.

D. Step 4—Evaluation of Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Full OPA and NEPA analysis would be performed on the remaining initiatives that have been determined to comprise the reasonable range of alternatives for marine mammal restoration projects. The OPA evaluation would address:

- The cost to carry out the alternative (e.g., cost to benefit).
- The extent to which each alternative is expected to meet the Trustees' goals and objectives in returning the injured natural resources and services to baseline and/or compensating for interim losses.
- The likelihood of success of each alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative will prevent future injury as a result of the incident and avoid collateral injury as a result of implementing the alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative benefits more than one natural resource and/or service.
- The effect of each alternative on public health and safety.

Full NEPA would be conducted for each of the projects that comprise the reasonable range.

Proposed Screening Methodology for Nutrient Reduction Projects

The PDARP sets out three goals for the nutrient reduction restoration type:

- Reduce nutrient loadings to Gulf Coast estuaries, habitats, and resources that are threatened by chronic eutrophication, hypoxia, or harmful algal blooms or that suffer habitat losses associated with water quality degradation.
- Where appropriate, co-locate nutrient load reduction projects with other restoration projects to enhance ecological services provided by other restoration approaches.
- Enhance ecosystem services of existing and restored Gulf Coast habitats.

The PDARP identifies agricultural conservation practices as a major potential restoration technique for reducing nutrient pollution; it also identifies an array of other restoration approaches including stormwater management practices, forestry management practices, creation and enhancement of wetlands, hydrologic restoration, and coastal and riparian conservation (PDARP, page 5-35). The PDARP states that "the Trustees will establish watershed selection criteria to inform site and project selection prior to implementing the restoration approach." The remainder of this note outlines the steps in the AL TIG's approach for selecting projects that meet the PDARP goals and objectives.

A. Step 1—Eligibility Screening

As with all the restoration types, project selection begins with identification of projects that have been submitted by the public that have been initially categorized as potentially targeting the restoration type under consideration.

Items to be considered:

- Projects address nutrient reduction resource concerns;
- Projects is not already funded; and
- Project is not duplicative of other projects on the list.

B. Step 2—Initial Project Screening Criteria

Using the set of projects identified as providing nutrient reduction benefits from the portal project sorting, conduct an initial project screening based the AL TIG's goals related to the PDARP restoration type and the following criteria.

Project is designed to make a significant direct contribution to reducing nutrients from agricultural or urban sources through implementation of **active**[1] measures to reduce nutrient loadings to coastal ecosystems injured by the DWH spill. These include:

1. agricultural conservation practices,
2. stormwater management practices,
3. forestry management practices,
4. creation and enhancement of wetlands, and
5. hydrologic restoration.

Note - Eliminated projects that addressed:

- Water Reuse
- Study/Assessment/ Data Collection/Monitoring (only)
- Drainage, streambank stabilization, and/or Creek channeling
- Sewer infrastructure
- Debris removal
- Heavy metal removal (water quality)
- Projects without a defined scope

C. Step 3—Project Specific Screening Considerations

After developing a 'short list' based on the application of the above criteria, each project would be reviewed to evaluate the proposed scope in relation to a variety of project specific considerations. Among the considerations would be:

1. Can the project be implemented within the budget available for this restoration plan or is there a source of other funds that can be leveraged in conjunction with NRDA funds available to allow implementation?
2. Is the project likely to be cost-effective?
3. Can the project be implemented in a reasonable time frame?
4. Does the project have a significant potential to result in adverse environmental or human health impacts?
5. Is the project funding activities required by local, state or federal law, order, or permit?
6. Are there any other impediments to carrying the project forward as part of the reasonable range of alternatives designated for more detailed OPA and NEPA analysis (e.g., compliance issues)?

[1] Non-Active measures would include conducting additional watershed planning

D. Step 4—Watershed(s) Considerations

Project occurs in the set of Alabama watersheds that (1) have completed watershed management plans,[2] (2) have large and well-documented sources of nutrients from agricultural lands and/or have substantial nutrient contributions from urban sources, and (3) are co-located or have synergistic benefits with other DWH restoration initiatives. Based on these criteria, projects in the following watersheds were identified for further consideration.

Mobile County

- Red Creek-Eightmile Creek
- Toulmins Spring Branch-Three Mile Creek
- Upper Dog River
- Lower Dog River
- Halls Mill Creek
- Fowl River
- Bayou La Batre
- West Fowl River

Baldwin County

- Upper Fish River
- Middle Fish River
- Lower Fish River
- Magnolia River
- Skunk Bayou
- Bon Secour River
- Oyster Bay
- D'Olive Creek (sub basin of the Tensaw River-Apalachee River)

Decisions of the AL TIG to move projects from Step 4 to the reasonable range of alternatives are based on a balancing of the considerations outlined above and in the context of the full suite of restoration alternatives being advanced for analysis in the restoration plan. As a result, a project considered in Step 4 may have received a generally favorable review but a decision was made not to move it to the reasonable range of alternatives for this plan. The reason or reasons a project has not been carried forward at this time will be documented in the restoration plan.

E. Step 5—OPA Evaluation

Full OPA and NEPA analysis would be performed on the remaining initiatives that have been determined to comprise the reasonable range of alternatives for nutrient reduction projects. The OPA evaluation would address:

[2] Watershed management plans have either been completed or are expected to be completed by summer of 2017.

- The cost to carry out the alternative (e.g., cost to benefit).
- The extent to which each alternative is expected to meet the Trustees' goals and objectives in returning the injured natural resources and services to baseline and/or compensating for interim losses.
- The likelihood of success of each alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative will prevent future injury as a result of the incident and avoid collateral injury as a result of implementing the alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative benefits more than one natural resource and/or service.
- The effect of each alternative on public health and safety.

Full NEPA would be conducted for each of the projects that comprise the reasonable range.

Proposed Screening Methodology for Oyster Projects

The PDARP sets out three goals for oyster restoration:

- Restore oyster abundance and spawning stock to support a regional oyster larvae pool sufficient for healthy recruitment levels to subtidal and nearshore oyster reefs.
- Restore resilience to oyster populations that are supported by productive larval source reefs and sufficient substrate in larval sink areas to sustain reefs over time.
- Restore a diversity of oyster reef habitats that provide ecological functions for estuarine- dependent fish species, vegetated shoreline and marsh habitat, and nearshore benthic communities.

The PDARP notes that '[t]his restoration will be accomplished by directly restoring reef habitat, enhancing oyster reef productivity, and restoring regional oyster recruitment by increasing oyster spawning stock populations and, subsequently, the regional larval supply.'

A. Step 1--Eligibility Screening

As with all the restoration types, project selection begins with identification of projects that have been submitted by the public that have been initially categorized as potentially targeting the restoration type under consideration

B. Step 2-- Initial Project Screening Criteria

Using the set of projects identified as providing oyster restoration benefits from the portal project sorting, conduct a general eligibility screening based the AL TIG's goals related to the PDARP restoration type and the following criteria.

1. Project (i) makes direct contributions to solving long-term oyster survivorship problems in Alabama coastal waters, or (ii) plays an important role in filling major scientific information or data gaps for oysters or (iii) promotes effective stewardship of oyster resources in the state.
2. Project is more appropriately conducted by the AL TIG than by the region-wide TIG. Project has a reasonable likelihood of success (e.g., occurs in waters of appropriate conditions).
3. Available information is sufficient to permit screening of the project.
4. Project does not fund activities required by local, state or federal law, order, or permit.
5. Project is not already fully funded—confirm but generally removed under Step 1.
6. Project is not duplicative of other projects on the list.

C. Step 3--Project Specific Screening Considerations

After developing a 'short list' based on the application of the above criteria, each project would be reviewed to evaluate the proposed scope in relation to a variety of project specific considerations. Among the considerations would be:

1. Can the project be implemented within the budget available for this restoration plan or is there a source of other funds that can be leveraged in conjunction with NRDA funds available to allow implementation?
2. Is the project expected to yield significant public (i.e., non-commercial) benefits.
3. Is the project cost-effective?
4. Can the project be implemented in a reasonable time frame?
5. Does the project have a significant potential to result in adverse environmental or human health impacts?
6. Are there any other impediments to carrying the project forward as part of the reasonable range of alternatives designated for more detailed OPA and NEPA analysis (e.g., compliance issues)?

Decisions of the AL TIG to move projects from Step 3 to the reasonable range of alternatives are based on a balancing of the considerations outlined above and in the context of the full suite of restoration alternatives being advanced for analysis in the restoration plan. As a result, a project considered in Step 3 may have received a generally favorable review but a decision was made not to move it to the reasonable range of alternatives for this plan. The reason or reasons a project has not been carried forward at this time will be documented in the restoration plan.

D. Step 4—Evaluation of Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Full OPA and NEPA analysis would be performed on the remaining initiatives that have been determined to comprise the reasonable range of alternatives for oyster restoration projects. The OPA evaluation would address:

- The cost to carry out the alternative (e.g. cost to benefit).
- The extent to which each alternative is expected to meet the Trustees' goals and objectives in returning the injured natural resources and services to baseline and/or compensating for interim losses
- The likelihood of success of each alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative will prevent future injury as a result of the incident and avoid collateral injury as a result of implementing the alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative benefits more than one natural resource and/or service.
- The effect of each alternative on public health and safety.

Full NEPA would be conducted for each of the projects that comprise the reasonable range.

Proposed Screening Methodology for Sea Turtle Projects

The PDARP sets out four goals for sea turtle restoration:

- Implement an integrated portfolio of restoration approaches to address all injured life stages (hatchling, juvenile, and adult) and species of sea turtles.
- Restore injuries by addressing threats to sea turtles in the marine and terrestrial environment such as bycatch in commercial and recreational fisheries, acute environmental changes (e.g., cold water temperatures), loss or degradation of nesting beach habitat (e.g., coastal armoring and artificial lighting), and other anthropogenic threats.
- Restore sea turtles in the various geographic and temporal areas within the Gulf of Mexico that are relevant to injured species and life stages.
- Support existing conservation efforts by ensuring consistency with recovery plans and recovery goals for each of the sea turtle species.

The PDARP identifies a variety of approaches for sea turtle restoration. These involve (1) identifying and implementing measures to reduce bycatch in commercial and recreational fisheries; (2) enhancing sea turtle hatchling productivity and restoring and conserving nesting beach habitat; (3) enhancing state enforcement to improve compliance with existing requirements to reduce bycatch in commercial fisheries; (4) increasing sea turtle survival through enhanced mortality investigations and early detection of and response to anthropogenic threats and emergency events; and (5) reducing injury and mortality of sea turtles from vessel strikes.

In addition, the AL TIG will consider projects that fill knowledge and data gaps specific to sea turtles using Alabama's terrestrial and in-water habitats.

A. Step 1—Eligibility Screening

As with all the restoration types, project selection begins with identification of projects that have been submitted by the public that have been initially categorized as potentially targeting the restoration type under consideration.

B. Step 2—Initial Project Screening Criteria

Using the set of projects identified as providing sea turtle restoration benefits from the portal project sorting, conduct a general eligibility screening based the AL TIG's goals related to the PDARP restoration type and the following criteria.

1. Project (i) makes direct contributions to reducing sea turtle bycatch and vessel collision mortality or injury in Alabama coastal waters, or (ii) enhances hatchling productivity or restores/conserves nesting habitat; or (iii) enhances enforcement; or (iv) increases

survival through actions to investigate and respond to threats and emergency incidents; or (v) fills knowledge or data gaps specific to sea turtles and habitats in Alabama.

2. Project is more appropriately conducted by the AL TIG than by the region-wide or open ocean TIGs or can't be effectively scaled for only Alabama (e.g., projects that would not benefit from region-wide economies of scale or coordination). Examples include projects that increase capacity of share the beach programs in Alabama, acquire land to protect locally valuable nesting sites, or address direct threats to or data gaps for sea turtles in Alabama.
3. Project has a reasonable likelihood of success.
4. Available information is sufficient or can be made sufficient in reasonable amount of time to permit screening of the project.
5. Project does not fund activities required by local, state or federal law, order, or permit.
6. Project is not already fully funded.
7. Project is not duplicative of other projects on the list.

Projects that receive a "yes" for all the above criteria (1 through 7) would be carried forward to Step 3 below for more project specific consideration.

C. Step 3--Project Specific Screening Considerations

After developing a 'short list' based on the application of the above criteria, each project would be reviewed to evaluate the proposed scope in relation to a variety of project specific considerations. Among the considerations would be:

1. Can the project be implemented within the budget available for this restoration plan or is there a source of other funds that can be leveraged in conjunction with NRDA funds available to allow implementation?
2. Is the project cost-effective?
3. Can the project be implemented in a reasonable time frame?
4. Does the project have a significant potential to result in adverse environmental or human health impacts?
5. Are there any other impediments to carrying the project forward as part of the reasonable range of alternatives designated for more detailed OPA and NEPA analysis (e.g., compliance issues)?

Decisions of the AL TIG to move projects from Step 3 to the reasonable range of alternatives are based on a balancing of the considerations outlined above and in the context of the full suite of restoration alternatives being advanced for analysis in the restoration plan. As a result, a project considered in Step 3 may have received a generally favorable review but a decision was made not to move it to the reasonable range of alternatives for this plan. The reason or reasons a project has not been carried forward at this time will be documented in the restoration plan.

D. Step 4—Evaluation of Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Full OPA and NEPA analysis would be performed on the remaining initiatives that have been determined to comprise the reasonable range of alternatives for sea turtle restoration projects. The OPA evaluation would address:

- The cost to carry out the alternative (e.g., cost to benefit).
- The extent to which each alternative is expected to meet the Trustees' goals and objectives in returning the injured natural resources and services to baseline and/or compensating for interim losses.
- The likelihood of success of each alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative will prevent future injury as a result of the incident and avoid collateral injury as a result of implementing the alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative benefits more than one natural resource and/or service.
- The effect of each alternative on public health and safety.

Full NEPA would be conducted for each of the projects that comprise the reasonable range.

Proposed Screening Methodology for Wetlands, Coastal, and Nearshore Habitats

For the Wetlands, Coastal and Nearshore Habitats (WCNH), the PDARP sets out three goals for restoration:

- Restore a variety of interspersed and ecologically connected coastal habitats in each of the five Gulf states to maintain ecosystem diversity, with particular focus on maximizing ecological functions for the range of resources injured by the spill, such as oysters, estuarine-dependent fish species, birds, marine mammals, and nearshore benthic communities.

- Restore for injuries to habitats in the geographic areas where the injuries occurred, while considering approaches that provide resiliency and sustainability.

- While acknowledging the existing distribution of habitats throughout the Gulf of Mexico, restore habitats in appropriate combinations for any given geographic area. Consider design factors, such as connectivity, size, and distance between projects, to address injuries to the associated living coastal and marine resources and restore the ecological functions provided by those habitats.

The PDARP highlights six restoration approaches relevant to Alabama for WCNH.

1. Create, restore and enhance coastal wetlands.
2. Restore oyster reef habitat.
3. Create, restore, and enhance barrier and coastal islands and headlands.
4. Restore and enhance dunes and beaches.
5. Restore and enhance submerged aquatic vegetation.
6. Protect and conserve marine, coastal, estuarine, and riparian habitats.

Step 1—Eligibility Screening

As with all the restoration types, project selection begins with identification of projects that have been submitted by the public that have been initially categorized as potentially targeting the restoration types under consideration—WCNH projects.

Step 2—Initial Project Screening Criteria

Using the set of projects identified as providing WCNH restoration benefits from the portal project sorting, conduct a general eligibility screening based the AL TIG's goals related to the PDARP restoration types and the following criteria.

1. Project (i) is located in areas identified as high priority for WCNH restoration by the AL TIG – specifically the estuarine portions of Mississippi Sound and Grand Bay, and the Fowl River, Weeks Bay, and Perdido Bay/River watersheds.
2. Project constitutes an actual project or a specific action, as opposed to a recommendation for a restoration type (e.g., acquisition of a specific parcel of property vs. acquisition of lands in Baldwin County).

3. Project focus is on **active** measures to meet the PDARP goals as opposed to research or monitoring activities.
4. Project does not fund activities required by local, state or federal law, order, or permit.
5. Project is not already fully funded.
6. Project is not duplicative of other projects on the list.

Projects that receive a "yes" for all the above criteria (1 through 6) would be carried forward to Step 3 below for more project specific screening.

Step 3--Project Specific Screening Considerations

After developing a 'short list' based on the application of the above criteria, each project would be reviewed to evaluate the proposed scope in relation to a variety of project specific considerations. Among the considerations would be:

1. Do the project techniques have a reasonable likelihood of being implemented successfully?
2. To what extent does the project protect or restore a continuum of habitats (e.g., nearshore reef to salt marsh to coastal freshwater wetlands and adjacent upland buffer) within the nearshore ecosystem and therefore contribute to an integrated, connected food web?
3. Will the project contribute to habitat protection or restoration in the vicinity of other projects proposed for selection in this plan, thereby achieving a greater overall benefit to nearshore habitats?
4. Is the project adjacent to land uses that would pose a threat to the success of the project?
5. Is the project consistent with existing management plans (e.g., watershed management plans or species recovery plans) and/or other previous efforts completed by federal, state, local, NGO, or academic entities?
6. Can the project be implemented within the budget available for this restoration plan or is there a source of other funds that can be leveraged in conjunction with NRDA funds available to allow implementation?
7. Is the project cost-effective?
8. Can the project be implemented in a reasonable time frame?
9. Does the project have a significant potential to result in adverse environmental or human health impacts?
10. Are there any other impediments to carrying the project forward as part of the reasonable range of alternatives designated for more detailed OPA and NEPA analysis (e.g., compliance issues)?

Decisions of the AL TIG to move projects from Step 3 to the reasonable range of alternatives are based on a balancing of the considerations outlined above and in the context of the full suite of restoration alternatives being advanced for analysis in the restoration plan. As a result, a project considered in Step 3 may have received a generally favorable review but a decision was made not to move it to the reasonable range of alternatives for this plan. The reason or reasons a project has not been carried forward at this time will be documented in the restoration plan.

Step 4—Evaluation of Reasonable Range of Alternatives

Full OPA and NEPA analysis would be performed on the remaining initiatives that have been determined to comprise the reasonable range of alternatives for WCNH restoration projects. The OPA evaluation would address:

- The cost to carry out the alternative (e.g., cost to benefit).
- The extent to which each alternative is expected to meet the Trustees' goals and objectives in returning the injured natural resources and services to baseline and/or compensating for interim losses.
- The likelihood of success of each alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative will prevent future injury as a result of the incident and avoid collateral injury as a result of implementing the alternative.
- The extent to which each alternative benefits more than one natural resource and/or service.
- The effect of each alternative on public health and safety.

Full NEPA would be conducted for each of the projects that comprise the reasonable range.