

HEP HABITAT RESTORATION PLANNING PROPOSALS RATING CRITERIA

Please use as much space as needed for comments. If working on a printout, please feel free to append additional pages.

Project Name:

Applicant's Name and Organization:

Review Committee Member:

| EVALUATION (Please circle one) | For HEP use | | |
|--|-------------|--------|--------|
| | Rating | Points | Weight |
| 1. JOINT PROJECT | | | |
| Is this project linked to a Stewardship proposal? | | | |
| 1 No 2 Yes | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| | | 0 | 1 |
| 2. AREA OF INFLUENCE (for projects requesting all or a substantial portion of available funds) | | | |
| Does the project include a plan to extend its influence beyond the site? | | | |
| 1 No 2 Yes | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| | | 0 | 1 |
| 3. GOALS OF THE PROJECT | | | |
| Does the proposal do a good job at clearly defining the goals for the project? Are goals realistic and relevant to HEP? | | | |
| 1 Inadequate 2 Modest 3 Adequate 4 Excellent | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| | | 0 | 2 |
| 4. TECs AND SITE SELECTION | | | |
| Does the project adequately address one of the focus TECs at the site? Does it make the case of why the site matters? Is there a clear indication that the site owner is a willing participant in the restoration effort? | | | |
| 1 Inadequate 2 Modest 3 Adequate 4 Excellent | | | |
| Comments: | | | |
| | | 0 | 2 |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| 5. SITE LOCATION | | | |
| Is the site within any of HEP's priority sites for restoration? | | | |
| 1 No 2 Yes | | | |
| <u>Comments:</u> | | | |
| | | 0 | 1 |
| 6. SITE IDENTIFICATION | | | |
| Clear identification of site proposed for conceptual planning, including map and photographs of area to be addressed | | | |
| 1 Inadequate 2 Poor 3 Adequate 4 Excellent | | | |
| <u>Comments:</u> | | | |
| | | 0 | 2 |
| 7. ADEQUACY OF SITE DATA | | | |
| Adequate data exists for site and no additional data collection is necessary. If data collection is needed, either the applicant has an approved QAPP or properly addresses the development and implementation of a QAPP in the proposal. | | | |
| 1 Inadequate 2 Poor 3 Adequate 4 Excellent | | | |
| <u>Comments:</u> | | | |
| | | 0 | 2 |
| 8. EXPERIENCE AND EXPERTISE | | | |
| The level of experience and expertise of the project team to carry out the project is | | | |
| 1 Inadequate 2 Modest 3 Adequate 4 Excellent | | | |
| <u>Comments:</u> | | | |
| | | 0 | 2 |
| 9. WORK PLAN | | | |
| Is the work plan sound and feasible? Are any relevant issues (e.g., regulatory requirements) identified and properly addressed? | | | |
| 1 Inadequate 2 Modest 3 Adequate 4 Excellent | | | |
| <u>Comments:</u> | | | |
| | | 0 | 2 |

| | | | |
|--|----------|----------|---|
| 10. IMPLEMENTATION | | | |
| Does the proposal provide an implementation plan once the conceptual restoration plan is completed? Does it identify realistic potential funding sources? Is there any indication of support from the potential funder(s)? | | | |
| 1 Inadequate 2 Modest 3 Adequate 4 Excellent | | | |
| <u>Comments:</u> | | | |
| | | 0 | 2 |
| 11. SCHEDULE | | | |
| Is the schedule realistic and likely to be met? Is the project expected to be completed by May 30 2009? Please characterize the proposed schedule as: | | | |
| 1 Inadequate 2 Poor 3 Adequate 4 Excellent | | | |
| <u>Comments:</u> | | | |
| | | 0 | 2 |
| 12. BUDGET | | | |
| Is the budget clearly presented and appropriate for the project? Does project completion require matching funds or contributions? Have these been secured? Please characterize the proposed budget as: | | | |
| 1 Inadequate 2 Poor 3 Adequate 4 Excellent | | | |
| <u>Comments:</u> | | | |
| | | 0 | 4 |
| <u>OTHER COMMENTS:</u> | | | |
| | | | |
| TOTAL | 0 | 0 | |