

Western LSR Competition PROJECT PROPOSAL CRITERIA

All project proposals will be screened and evaluated based on the following:

Screening Criteria

| | | |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Meets the general project eligibility and sidebars | Yes = Eligible | No = Ineligible |
| Meets the 1:1 non-federal match requirement ¹ | Yes = Eligible | No = Ineligible |
| Addresses one or more of the S&PF National Themes and associated outcomes | Yes = Eligible | No = Ineligible |

Evaluation Criteria^{2, 3}

| | 4-5 pts - High | 3 pts – Medium | 0-2 pts - Low |
|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Project Overview/Purpose Statement</i> | Provides a succinct and relevant overview; could easily be used to communicate critical elements and value of the project. | Summarized the project but has little communication value. | Does not effectively summarize the proposed project. |

| | 10-15 pts - High | 4-9 pts – Medium | 0-3 pts - Low |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Context, Goals, and Objectives</i> | Context clearly identifies priority landscapes and, issues that are being addressed. Goals and objectives address the national themes being addressed by the project. | Project context, goals and objectives are present, but underdeveloped. The priority landscape and/or national themes are not adequately addressed. | Project context, goals, and objectives are unclear. |

| | 14-20 pts - High | 6-13 pts – Medium | 0-5 pts - Low |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Proposed Activities</i> | Clearly describes with specificity, activities to be completed with grant funds and leveraged resources. Links specific project activities to funding amounts in the Project Budget and to stated project goals and objectives. | Describes project activities and how grant funds and leveraged resources will be used, but lacks detail and/or some resources included in the Project Budget are unaccounted for. Links to the stated goals and objectives may be weak. | Insufficient detail is provided as to what work will be completed using grant funds and leveraged resources. Little or no link to the Project Budget or stated goals and objectives. |

(1) The allocated grant amount must be matched in full and along program authorities by the recipient using non-federally funded sources, except as authorized for the Insular Areas in 48USC1469a and Amendment of Subsection (d). Matching requirements for dollars awarded through the competitive allocation process may be met through consolidation as currently handled through consolidated payment grants.

(2) Only full point scores will be assigned; no zeroes will be assigned unless a field is left blank. The maximum total score any one application can receive is 100. Each LSR team reviewer must resolve any scoring ties between assigned applications, to yield a ranked list of reviewed applications from 1 to x. The application rankings are averaged across the reviewers, with the highest average ranked application receiving funding priority.

(3) The first time an acronym is used, write out the full name followed by the acronym in parentheses in capital letters. Later, use only the acronym.

| | 10-15 pts - High | 4-9 pts – Medium | 0-3 pts - Low |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Deliverables and Outcomes</i> | Defines deliverables and outcomes which will achieve the national themes addressed by the project. Provides clear, quantitative measures of success. | Project deliverables are described, though how they are measured is unclear, or they are not easily measured. Project outcomes are vague and there is some question how they support project goals and national themes. | Insufficient detail is provided as to what the project deliverables and outcomes are. Unclear or no measures of success or whether the stated goals can be achieved. |
| <i>Collaboration/Cross Boundary</i> | Project uses coordination and partnerships with complementary state and federal programs to improve outcomes. Clearly describes how partners are committed and will add value during project development and implementation. Collaboration will clearly result in a successful cross-boundary project. | Collaboration with partners is identified but contribution to project or commitment to outcomes is limited. Discussion of how partners have been engaged is limited. Cross-boundary impacts are limited or unclear. | Very little of no collaboration appears to exist. The project does not appear to have a cross-boundary impact. |

| | 7-10 pts - High | 3-6 pts – Medium | 0-2 pts - Low |
|-----------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>Forest Action Plan Integration</i> | Clearly describes the need for the proposed project and relates it to one or more priority landscapes, issues, areas, or strategies identified in the Forest Action Plan. | Need for the project is apparent but underdeveloped and/or link to Forest Action Plan is unclear. | Little to no information is provided as to why the project is a priority or how it relates to the Forest Action Plan. |
| <i>Meaningful Scale/Cross Boundary</i> | Scale of the project is clearly based on and is appropriate for the stated goals, objectives, and outcomes including cross boundary goals. The scale is sufficient to address the national theme and priority landscape and issues. | Scale of the project appears to be only partially based on or appropriate for the stated goals, objectives, and outcomes including cross boundary goals. The scale may not be sufficient to address the national theme and priority landscape and issues. | Scale of the project does not appear to be based on or appropriate for the stated goals, objectives, and outcomes including cross boundary goals. The scale is clearly not sufficient to address the national theme and priority landscape and issues. |
| <i>Sustainability of Outcomes</i> | Project clearly results in skills and enhanced capability that extend beyond the life of the project. Project displays how this investment will lead to a specific, quantifiable, cost effective, replicable benefit that addresses national themes. | Project may result in skills, enhanced capability beyond the life of the project, but it is limited or unclear. | Description does not address how the project will create lasting skills and capability. Project would be difficult to replicate elsewhere. |