

# Sage-Grouse Actions Team Habitat Projects

## Grant Application Evaluation Worksheet

February 2020

Project #: \_\_\_\_\_ Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Amount Requested from the Actions Team: \$ \_\_\_\_\_ \*Your Name: \_\_\_\_\_

*Your written evaluation will remain confidential. However, we will collect all your evaluations at the end of the review session.*

**THRESHOLD QUESTIONS** (All answers must be “Yes” for the project to be eligible). In general, the application/project:

- Yes       No      Is complete enough to review
- Yes       No      Addresses Primary/Secondary threats to sage-grouse
- Yes       No      Demonstrates sound principles that will benefit the sage steppe ecosystem
- Yes       No      Uses methods adapted to the project locale
- Yes       No      If applicable, has the applicant completed all projects and reporting requirements from previous SGAT or other grants within the last three years?

**INSTRUCTIONS.** The application evaluation is divided into three sections: Project Activity Criteria, Administrative/Fiscal Criteria, which are scored jointly, and the Monitoring Project Activity Criteria of the grant application. The third section (Monitoring) is scored separately and only needs to be filled out if there is a monitoring component to the grant that requests Actions Team dollars. Information on where the answer to each question can be found in the application is shown in parentheses. Write comments, as appropriate. **Assign a score for each question within the range provided in the final column, with a higher score representing a better answer.** When you’ve rated each question, add the scores for a subtotal for each section.

PROJECT ACTIVITY CRITERIA (Refer to Part II of the <u>application template</u> for all questions below)	COMMENTS	SCORE
1. Does project positively affect Priority, Important, or General sage-grouse habitat? (Part II, 1 & 4)		<b>General – Low Important -Med. Priority - High</b>
2. Is the project in an area that has tripped a population or habitat trigger? Points will be given if project is expected to improve habitat to offset the trigger. (Get info from IDFG or BLM biologist on Actions Team)		<b>No – Low Yes - High</b>
Priority project type by Conservation Area as identified in the <i>Science Plan for Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Actions in Idaho</i>		<b>Will be added to application as a criterion in the future</b>

<p>3. Land ownership (Part II, 1) (Project components directly affect the ownership)</p>		<p><b>Federal – Low State, Tribal, Private – Med. More than one - High</b></p>
<p>4. The application adequately describes current conditions (Part II, 2) (Part II, 3).</p>		<p><b>Scoring based on detail and explanation.</b></p>
<p>5. Does the project address primary (wildfire, invasive species), secondary threats to sage-grouse in that Conservation Area? (Part II, 3)</p>		<p><b>Secondary – Low Primary – High Wet Meadows – Additional Sagebrush Establishment - Additional</b></p>
<p>6. The application clearly defines the sage-grouse threat(s) and the how the project is expected to minimize the threat(s) (Part II, 3 &amp; 4)</p>		<p><b>Scoring based on detail and explanation.</b></p>
<p>7. The project has clearly defined, <i>measurable</i> objectives.</p>		<p><b>Scoring based on detail and explanation.</b></p>
<p>8. The project <b>(a)</b> complements other efforts under way or completed in the surrounding landscape, and <b>(b)</b> is associated with a local, state, or regional strategic plan. (Part II, 2)</p>		<p><b>Scoring based on detail and explanation.</b></p>
<p>9. The proposed project schedule is well thought out and appears to be realistic. (Part II, 5)</p>		<p><b>Scoring based on detail and explanation.</b></p>
<p>10. Monitoring. A) Not identified. B) An appropriate monitoring program and monitoring outcomes are clearly identified OR project does not require monitoring to be considered an effective project. (Part II, 9)</p>		<p><b>Scoring based on detail and explanation.</b></p>

ADMIN & FISCAL CRITERIA	COMMENTS	SCORE
<p>1. The budget <b>(a)</b> shows sufficient detail for all categories, <b>(b)</b> unit quantities/costs appear to be reasonable, appropriate, and consistent with local rates or NRCS cost share rates.</p> <p>(Part. III Budget Page)</p>		<p><b>Scoring based on detail and explanation.</b></p>
<p>2. The project has appropriate levels of involvement and support from the right parties and partners. (Partners are considered funding partners, does not include Landowner) (Part. II, 2 &amp; 12)</p>		<p><b>No Partners = Low</b></p> <p><b>1-2 Partners = Med.</b></p> <p><b>3 or more = High</b></p>
<p>3. The applicant has match for the project. Applicant is awarded higher scores for more secured match. (Match is defined as something that directly affects the project) (Part II, 12)</p>		<p><b>No = Low</b></p> <p><b>26-50% = Med.</b></p> <p><b>51-75% = High</b></p> <p><b>&gt;75% = Very High</b></p>
<p><b>TOTAL</b></p>		

MONITORING PROJECT ACTIVITY CRITERIA (Refer to Section III for all questions below)	COMMENTS	SCORE
<p><b>Fill this out ONLY if the applicant is applying for additional funds to for monitoring</b></p> <p>7. <b>(a)</b> Monitoring is linked to the project objectives described in Part II d, <b>(b)</b> type of monitoring proposed is appropriate, <b>(c)</b> protocols to be used are appropriate for the type of monitoring identified, <b>(d)</b> frequency and duration of monitoring is adequate, <b>(e)</b> they make a strong justification for why the monitoring is needed. (Part II, 9)</p>		<p><b>Scoring based on detail and explanation.</b></p>
<p><b>TOTAL (Just for Monitoring)</b></p>		