

Criteria Used to Score FY2017 NFHP Project Proposals for the Mat-Su Salmon Partnership

Project Title:

Reviewer:

Eligibility Screening - must be able to answer "yes" to each of the following questions:	Y/N
Does proposal address one or more of the strategies identified in the Mat-Su Salmon Habitat Partnership's Strategic Action Plan?	___
If multi-annual, is there a breakdown of tasks and budget by year?	___
If applicable, the proposal includes landowner consent?	___

	Points (itemized)	Scoring Guidance	Reviewers Score	Comments
1. Resource Benefits: How well the proposed approach serves to protect, restore, or enhance Matanuska-Susitna fish habitats and fish species as specified in the Strategic Action Plan. (35 points)				
a) Proposal focuses directly on anadromous Mat-Su-salmon and their habitat	10	10=Yes; 0=No	0	
b) Proposal addresses one or more potential threats and incorporates conservation strategies identified in the Mat-Su Salmon Partnership strategic plan (2013) .	15	15=clearly identified and described, 7=moderate, 1=not well described or 0= strategies not incorporated		
c) Proposal accurately describes how it provides short and long-term benefits for Mat-Su salmon and/or their habitat and social and economic benefits. For projects that require maintenance, there is a description of ownership and maintenance responsibility.	10	10=clearly identified and described, 7=moderate, 1=not well described or 0= strategies not incorporated		
2. Performance Measures (30 points)				
d) Proposal describes measurable results (eg - numbers of stream miles opened or restored, acres of stream or wetland protected or other relevant measurable outcomes). OR Proposal describes and identifies relevant outreach or assessment measureable outcomes from the project and how they inform conservation or restoration actions.	10		0	
e) Proposal describes project implementation steps including tasks and timelines.	10			
f) Proposal includes monitoring plan that follows the guidance in the strategic action plan (2013 - Appendix 12). Assessment and outreach projects do not have guidance yet and rely on the proposer for clearly articulated monitoring plan.	10			
3. Budget and Cost Sharing (20 points)				
g) Describe budget, all budget items are justified in-the proposal objectives, and multiannual proposals have a breakdown of tasks by year.	10		0	
h) The proposal documents non-federal and/or federal support with matching or leveraged funds/ in-kind services. Proposal indicates the cost-share ratio.	10	Points for each cost-share ratio are: 10 points for ≥3:1; 8≥2:1; 6≥1:1; 2<1:1, 0=No match		
4. Applicant Qualifications (15 points)				
i) Key organizations and personnel are described and have capabilities to complete proposal.	10		0	
j) Proposal provides examples of applicant's relevant experience conducting similar projects.	5			
Total Possible			Reviewers Score	
Total		100	0	

BONUS: Proposal addresses one or more partnership priority objectives.	5			
---	---	--	--	--

Note: this score sheet and criteria incorporates NFHP *Minimum Benchmarks Guidance for Project Selection* , *National Conservation Strategies* , and *Evaluating Fish Habitat Partnership Performance 2013* documents.