

HPC PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

<i>Criteria</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Rating Score</i>
WILDLIFE VALUE	This should fit directly to an MFA. Project should explicitly benefit big game and answer a direct NEED.	NOT ELIGIBLE - No clear benefit to big game- STOP RANKING 4 = clear benefit to big game but not critical to GMU's population 6 = clear benefit to big game and answers a critical need for GMU's population 8 = clear benefit to big game, answers a critical population need and benefits other wildlife
SPORTSMAN VALUE	Project should demonstrate a clear benefit to the public	0 = no explicit sportsmen access 2 = no explicit access but will enhance opportunities in adjacent areas with unlimited access 4 = limited or walk in access only 6 = limited or walk in access but will enhance opportunities in adjacent areas with unlimited access 8 = unlimited hunter access or public land
PROPOSAL INFORMATION	Proposals should answer the basic "who what where why when how and how much"	0= Inadequate- I have many question regarding all of the criteria (who what where when why how, how much) 2 = Average (I understand what they propose to do, but the details are not clear: (who what where when why how, how much) 4 = Excellent (everything is clearly explained with a realistic 2 year implementation schedule)
SHOVEL READY	Projects should be ready for implementation within 6 months for eligibility	0 = compliance not started 5 = compliance process has been started with documentation included- assurances to complete within 6 months 10 = compliance completed and documentation included
LHPC/REGIONAL PRIORITY	Where does this project fit into the Regional and LHPC priorities	0 = Low Regional/LHPC support or priority 4 = Mid-level Regional/LHPC support or priority 8 = High, tops the list of Regional/LHPC priorities
STRATEGIC LANDSCAPE LEVEL	Project funding preference is given to landscape scale projects	4= independent project 8= fits into complimentary efforts, large footprint (spatial or time) 14= Stand-alone landscape project or initiative that targets multiple limiting factors
CONTINUATION OF DEPT OR HPC INVESTMENT	Does the project help protect a Department's investment? E.g. maintenance on property, catchment or vegetation retreatment	0 = no new investment 10 = compliments existing work or infrastructure

Criteria	Description	Rating Score
PROJECT TYPE One score = 5, 10, or 20 for each proposal based on the project types listed below		
New Department water	New waters only eligible under AD approval	5
Dirt tank work	Cleanout, sealing, maintenance	5
Water redevelopment	Redevelopments or existing infrastructure	10
Pipeline	Pipeline with multiple drinkers	10
Rx fire	Prescribed fires- new or re-entry	20
Grassland or browse	Mastication, grubbing, herbicide, hand crews, etc.	20
Grassland retreat	Same actions as above with preference to areas that have been previously treated	20
Other habitat work	Enclosures, contouring, etc..	10
Structures benefitting connectivity	Construction or modification of passage structure (over/underpass, fencing, jump outs etc.) that will enhance the distribution or connectivity for the focal big game species	20
Wildlife management	Capture/translocation, supplemental surveys, population management, etc.	10
MATCH (In Kind or Direct)	It is not a requirement, but projects should strive for at least a 1:1 match. Does the project leverage cost sharing with partners or outside funding sources? NOTE: Matching funds should be evaluated in direct relation to the current project as proposed	0 = no match or <1:1 match 5 = >1:1 & <2:1 match 10 = >2:1 match
COST EFFECTIVENESS	How does this project compare to recent similar projects? Are the project's costs concurrent with Market?	0 = > similar projects 4 = similar projects 8= project costs are cheaper than similar projects