



DESERT FISH HABITAT PARTNERSHIP

Desert Fish Habitat Partnership Proposal Evaluation and Criteria Form

DFHP Regional Workgroups and Executive and Steering Committees will consider the following factors in selecting projects for funding:

| | DFHP Evaluation Criteria | Maximum Points |
|----|---|-----------------------|
| 1. | <p>DFHP Habitat and Species Addressed</p> <p>a. Does the proposed project address an identified DFHP Habitat (pg 2 Strategic Framework)?</p> <p>b. Are DFHP species (pg 26 Strategic Framework) identified with ranks? Are multiple species involved?</p> | 15 |
| 2. | <p>Project Objectives and Measurable Outcomes</p> <p>a. Does the proposal protect, maintain, or restore healthy habitats for DFHP species?</p> <p>b. Does the proposal fit into larger conservation efforts, such as the DFHP Strategy, state wildlife action plans, multi-species conservation plans, habitat conservation plans, recovery plans, or other local plans?</p> | 15 |
| 3. | <p>Technical Merit</p> <p>a. Is the proposal supported by sound and established scientific, hydrological and biological studies or principles?</p> <p>b. Will the project enhance or sustain species diversity, increase populations of target species, and maintain or increase aquatic ecosystem function?</p> <p>c. Does the project have a high likelihood to provide long-term benefits for DFHP priority species and habitats?</p> <p>d. Does the project applicant and partners have sufficient technical qualifications to complete the project?</p> | 15 |
| 4. | <p>Proposal format</p> <p>a. Did the project applicant provide all of the information required by the RFP and in the proper format?</p> | 5 |
| 5. | <p>Partnerships/Community Support</p> <p>a. Does the project have multiple and diverse partners working in collaboration?</p> <p>b. Are there letters of support or signed documentation from approving officials and/or affected landowners stating their commitment to the proposed project?</p> <p>c. Does the project have a high probability of being completed in the next 2 years if it is funded?</p> | 15 |

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 6. | Environmental and Regulatory Compliance (e.g., ESA, NEPA, 404 permits, or other permits as required) a. Has project applicant demonstrated adequate planning to ensure project implementation and completion? b. Which NEPA, 404 or other state and federal permits are needed to execute the project and have they been acquired? If not, when will they be filed and obtained? (Projects with completed NEPA/state permits will receive higher priority). | 10 |
| 7. | Monitoring and Best Management Practices a. Does the proposal include a monitoring plan with clear objectives for evaluating the success and goals of the project? b. Does the monitoring plan include both pre-and post-project monitoring activities? c. Do the Best Management Practices or conservation actions proposed include a description and timeline of the long-term maintenance responsibilities that assure the project will be successful and the results sustainable? | 10 |
| 8. | Budget a. Are cost estimates appropriate, focused on actions linked to DFHP objectives, well justified and reasonable? b. Does the project leverage other government or private funding or in-kind resources that work toward a 1 federal: 1 non-federal cost share? c. Is partner funding and/or resources an important element for project implementation? d. Does the project link to or add value to another existing or | 10 |
| 9. | Public Outreach a. Does the proposal have a viable and effective public outreach component? b. Is the local community involved in the project? c. Are there plans to include electronic outreach? Example: internet website. d. Are there plans to develop an on-site kiosk? e. Will there be media involvement? Examples: newspaper, interviews. | 5 |
| | | 100 |

TOTAL SCORE

Scores for each of the ten criteria can range from the maximum to the minimum using the following scale:

0-20% of the total points for little or no relevant response

21%-45% of the total points for a minimal relevant response

46%-70% of the total points for a well-supported response

71%-100% of the total points for an exceptional response in which the Project Applicant gives evaluators the information they need and is clear and concise with documented support.