

**Vermont's
Wildlife Action Plan***

November 22, 2005

**Appendix: J
State Wildlife Grants
Competitive Grant Program Proposal
Evaluation Form**

**formally the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (CWCS)*

State Wildlife Grants Competitive Grant Program Proposal Evaluation Form

Draft 6/1/05

Project Title: _____

Submitted by: _____

Cooperators (if any) _____

Date submitted: _____

Estimated Project Cost (total) \$ _____ Requested from SWG: \$ _____

Match amount \$ _____ Source of match: _____

Staff* \$ _____

Equipment \$ _____

Outreach materials \$ _____

Training \$ _____

Other \$ _____

*FWD personnel only:
include indirect costs
here too.

Will funds be used to fill a temporary position or any other type of special or special hires (if yes please describe)?

Reviewed by: _____

Date: _____

Score _____

Questions/recommendations: _____

project title _____

Which Species of Greatest Conservation Need and/or habitat(s) will the project benefit?

Which Limiting Factor(s) to SGCN(s) and/or habitats will this project address?

How will this project remove or reduce the impact of the limiting factor?

Reviewers: Use the following criteria to evaluate each SWG proposal.

Scoring Proposals

Write in and circle the appropriate score for each criterion.

Maximum possible score: 260 Points

1. State Wildlife Grants Appropriateness

Max 40 points

1.1 Will this project help conserve species or species groups of greatest conservation need or their habitats?

(not appropriate) 0 5 10 15 20 (very appropriate)

If '0' (not appropriate) do not continue ranking this proposal.

1.2 Is other federal funding (e.g. Pittman-Robertson, Dingell-Johnson, Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act) available in place of SWG funds?

(Yes) 0 5 10 15 20 (No)

2. Matching Funds

Max 10 points

2.1 Has the appropriate match (25% for planning or 50% for implementation) requirement been met (score 5) or exceeded (score >5)? Does the project leverage significant additional funding? If no met (score 0).

(match not met) 0 5 10 (match exceeded)

If '0' (match not met) do not continue ranking this proposal.

3. State Wildlife Grants Intent

Max 40 points

3.1 Does this project demonstrate the principle behind SWG, which is that fish and wildlife agencies are taking on non-traditional responsibilities, and/or responding to non-traditional audiences, and therefore need non-traditional funding sources?

(no new direction) 0 5 10 15 20 (new direction demonstrated)

3.2 Does this project fill a specific unmet conservation need identified in the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy?

(ignores priority projects) 0 5 10 (fills priority project need)

3.3 Does the project provide important conservation information or address the unmet needs of species/species groups of greatest conservation concern and their habitats?

(ignores priority projects) 0 5 10 (fills priority project need)

4. Conservation Impact

Max 105 points

4.1 Does the project involve a conservation issue that must be dealt with as soon as possible?

(not timely) 1 5 10 (very timely)

4.2 Will the project stop or reverse a decline in a population, or provide data vital to stopping or reversing a decline?

(won't stop/reverse decline) 1 5 10 (will stop/reverse decline)

4.3 Does the project address species of greatest conservation need (SGCN)?

(No SGCN addressed) 0 5 10 (high priority SGCN)

4.4 Does the project benefit multiple Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN)?

(one SGCN) 1 5 10 15 20 (multiple SGCN)
 1 species=1pts, 2-10=10pts, 11-20=20pts

4.5 Does the project link existing protected areas or is it adjacent to existing protected areas (i.e. does it reduce fragmentation)?

(no link) 1 5 10 (links protected areas)

4.6 In addition to its focus on wildlife, does the project provide significant benefit to plant SGCN and other imperiled plant species?

(no plant SGCN benefit) 1 2 3 4 5 (plant SGCN benefit)

4.7 Does the project benefit rare habitats?

(no rare habitats benefit) 1 5 10 (rare habitats benefit)
 score by S-rank and....

4.8 Will the project contribute a long term benefit to the public or to species with greatest unmet conservation needs? Does the project appear to have the potential for "life" after SWG funding ends? Is there a plan/process to "market" the project as a model or demonstration area once completed and/or will the information gathered contribute to long term conservation goals?

(no long term relevance) 1 5 10 (long term relevance)

4.9 Will the data from this project be demonstrably useful for updating Vermont's Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy?

(No) 1 5 10 (Yes)

5. Social Impact

Max 30 points

5.1 Does the proposal bring traditional and/or nontraditional partners to the table? Does the project involve state and/or local decision-makers? Is there multi-partner involvement (federal, state, and local governments or agencies, businesses, private landowners, NGO's, research institutions, citizens, etc)?

(partners not significant) 1 2 3 4 5 (partners significant)

5.2 Will the project be useful to other agencies and organizations? Can it serve as a model process or demonstration site?

(not useful as model) 1 2 3 4 5 (very useful)

5.3 Does the project have an educational component that will lead to increased appreciation, understanding, support, stewardship, of wildlife?

(no education component) 1 2 3 4 5 (strong education component)

5.4 Does the project have potential for widespread or statewide public/media appeal?

(low appeal) 1 2 3 4 5 (high appeal)

5.5 Does the project encourage public involvement in its implementation or use? Is it open for public use and enjoyment (where appropriate) and/or engage the full range of conservation interests (public and private sectors, traditional and non-traditional constituencies, etc)?

(low public benefit) 1 2 3 4 5 (high public benefit)

5.6 Does the project demonstrate multiple benefits? (Conservation and/or recreation and/or education; benefit terrestrial and aquatic species; consumptive and non-consumptive users, etc)

(narrow benefit) 1 2 3 4 5 (multiple benefits)

6. Other Factors

Max 35 points

6.1 What is the overall feasibility of the project?

(infeasible as proposed) 1 5 10 (very feasible)

6.2 Project timeliness: is the project ready or near-ready to implement? Will there be significant deliverables within the first fiscal year?

(long start up required) 1 5 10 (project ready to go)

6.3 Are project activities focused on achieving the stated goals and objectives? Does the project have clearly stated objectives, well designed procedures and realistically attainable results? (For research & inventory projects: Are sample sizes adequate? Is data analysis and utilization, and methods for sharing results included?)

(activities not focused) 1 5 10 (activities focused)

6.4 What is the capability of project personnel for completing the project (the applicant's history with previous projects can be used to assess this criterion)?

(Potential for success low) 1 2 3 4 5 (Potential for success high)