SWG Project Evaluation Criteria

(100 Points Maximum)

Following are ranking criteria used to evaluate submitted proposals.

1. Commission Priority — Max 20 points

1.1 Does the project address a Commission-identified priority (as posted on Commission web site under SWG '12 Priorities)?

(not a SWG '12 priority) 0 5 10 (SWG '12 priority)

1.2 Is this project likely to benefit WAP-priority species and/or their associated habitats?

(not likely) 0 5 10 (highly likely)

If '0' (not likely) do not continue ranking this proposal. The summary sheet will score this project a zero.

2. Relevance to the Wildlife Action Plan — Max 20 points

2.1 Does the project target one or more of the 12 bird/mammal species identified as imperiled + responsibility within the WAP? (i.e. Allegheny woodrat, eastern small-footed *Myotis*, Appalachian cottontail, northern *Myotis*, cerulean warbler, golden-winged warbler, Henslow's sparrow, Louisiana waterthrush, wood thrush, scarlet tanager, worm-eating warbler, tundra swan (migratory population).

(no priority species) 0 5 10 (multiple priority species)

2.2 Will the project help to address required elements in the revision of the WAP?

(does not address elements) 0 5 10 (addresses multiple elements)

3. Project Focus — Max 10 points

3.1 Does the applicant clearly state what will be accomplished and how this will benefit WAP-priority species or habitats?

(activities not focused) 1 2 3 4 5 (activities focused)

3.2 How timely is the proposed project? Does it involve a conservation issue that must be dealt with as soon as possible?

(not timely) 1 2 3 4 5 (very timely)

4. Project Budget/Deliverables/Timeline — Max 15 points

4.1 Is the project ready or near-ready to implement? Will there be significant deliverables within the first fiscal year?

(long start-up required) 1 2 3 4 5 (project ready to go)

4.2 Are the deliverables clearly identified, achievable, and commensurate with the budget and timeline?

(Deliverables not identified or reasonable) 1 2 3 4 5(deliverables identified and reasonable)

4.3 Does the project leverage SWG funds with non-federal funds/in-kind contributions?

(minimum 65:35 match rate met) 1 2 3 4 5 (SWG funds highly leveraged)

5. Project Impact Max 20 points

5.1 Does the project address the five guiding principles of the Wildlife Action Plan (i.e., 1. endangered species prevention, 2. keeping common species common, 3. recognizing the responsibility role of PA, 4. building partnerships, 5. comprehensive approach?

(principles not supported) 1 2 3 4 5 (WAP guiding principles)

5.2 Does the project have potential impact beyond Pennsylvania – is it a multi-state or multi-region effort? Does it contribute to large scale improvement for the species?

(localized impact) 1 2 3 4 5 (large scale impact)

5.3 Does project target an Immediate Concern, High Level Concern, or Responsibility species?

(nopriority species) 1 2 3 4 5 (multiple WAP priority species)

5.4 Does the project bring traditional and/or nontraditional partners to the table? Does it 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)

6. Project Scope Max 15 points

6.1 Will the project have long term relevance? Does the project appear to have the potential to continue after SWG funding ends? Is there a plan/process to market the project as a pilot/model process or demonstration area?

(no long term relevance) 1 2 3 4 5 (long term relevance)

6.2 Does the project provide long-term benefits to the species' conservation in PA?

(short-sighted) 1 2 3 4 5 (long-term benefits likely)

6.3 Is there a monitoring component in order to assess species' response and develop adaptive management recommendations?

(no adaptive management) 1 2 3 4 5 (adaptive management enabled)