

HEP HABITAT RESTORATION PLANNING PROPOSALS -- RATING CRITERIA

Instructions: Please rate all items below, considering how the proposal addresses the key aspects noted for each. Please use as much space as needed for comments. If working on a printout, feel free to append additional pages.

Project Title:

Applicant's Name and Organization:

Joint Stewardship Project (Y/N):

Review Committee Member:

Potential conflict of interest of applicant with HEP (Y/N):

Potential conflict of interest of applicant with reviewer (Y/N):

EVALUATION (Please circle one or enter value in Rating cell)	Rating	For HEP use		Maximum points
		Points	Weight	
1. GOALS & RATIONALE OF THE PROJECT Does the proposal clearly define the goals for the project? Are goals realistic and relevant to HEP? Does the proposal make the case for why the project is needed? 1 Inadequate 2 Modest 3 Adequate 4 Excellent Comments:			2	8
2. 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:			2	8
3. AREA OF INFLUENCE Does the project include a plan to extend its influence beyond the site? 1 No 2 Yes Comments:			2	4
4. SITE LOCATION Is the site within any of HEP's priority sites for restoration? 1 No 2 Yes Comments:			1	2
5. 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 Comments:			2	8
6. 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 Comments:			2	8
7. WORKPLAN Is the workplan sound and feasible? Are any relevant issues (e.g., regulatory requirements) identified and properly addressed? 1 Inadequate 2 Modest 3 Adequate 4 Excellent Comments:			2	8
8. PROFESSIONAL MERIT Please characterize the project team's qualifications to carry out the project. 1 Inadequate 2 Modest 3 Adequate 4 Excellent Comments:			2	8

9. 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 Comments:			2	8
10. SCHEDULE Is the schedule realistic and likely to be met? Is the project expected to be completed by August 30, 2010? Please characterize the proposed schedule as: 1 Inadequate 2 Poor 3 Adequate 4 Excellent Comments:			2	8
11. 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 Comments:			4	16
OTHER COMMENTS:				
TOTAL				86