

General WREP Evaluation Sheet

Spreadsheet #	
Project Name	
State	
Partner	
Acres	
Dollars	
Ranking Score	0

Question	Points	Partnership Contributions (35%) 70 Points	Ranking Score	Comments
1		To what extent does the proposal significantly leverage non-Federal financial and technical resources? (Ratio of Non-Federal technical assistance plus financial assistance provided divided by the Financial assistance request. Includes in-kind technical and planning assistance (choose one))		
	10	25% (minimum)	0	
	20	> 25%	0	
	30	> 30%	0	
	40	> 35%	0	
2	10	Does the proposal clearly describe outreach efforts to promote participation of beginning farmers or ranchers, socially disadvantaged farmers or ranchers, and Indian tribes? (Y/N)	0	
3	10	Does the proposal provide assurances of landowner participation, and has the applicant completed preliminary assessments of landowner interest within the proposed project area? (Y/N)	0	
4	10	Does the proposal ensure the availability of the resources to be contributed to WREP projects, including all matching funds? (Y/N)		
		Note: WRPO plan development may consist of assistance or support related to such activities as topographic surveys, engineering design, obtaining regulatory permits, soil and hydrology assessments, hydraulic analysis, GPS surveys, mapping, etc.	0	
Planning and Assessment (15%) - 30 points				
1	10	Does the proposal demonstrate a history of working cooperatively with landowners either through successful completion of past projects or initiatives with landowners? (Y/N)	0	
2	10	Does the proposal provide evidence that the restoration and enhancement activities will be completed within 2 years of closing the easement? (Y/N)	0	
3		Does the proposal include a monitoring plan, and if so, what level of monitoring will be used?		
	1	Monitoring involves random site visits to assess habitat quality and diversity.	0	
	5	Monitoring plan uses statistically valid data collection to evaluate a single resource factor.	0	
	10	Monitoring plan uses statistically valid data collection to evaluate multiple resource factor.	0	
		Example: Resource factors may include vegetative transects, wildlife scans and point counts, hydrology assessments, water quality sampling, etc. Statistically valid monitoring protocol must also include the development of baseline data in order to track habitat changes over time as well as contributions of the project in meeting ACEP-WRE objectives.		
Resource Outcomes (50%) - 100 points				
4	20	Does the proposal specifically address assisting participants meeting local, State, and/or Federal regulatory requirements? (for example, meeting TMDL thresholds) (Y/N)	0	
5	20	Does the proposal have a high potential to improve habitat for migratory birds and other wetland-dependent wildlife? (Y/N)	0	
6	20	Does the proposal identify direct benefits to wetland dependent Federal or State listed T&E Species? (Y/N)	0	
7	20	Does the proposal utilize innovative restoration methods and practices in a targeted fashion to facilitate maximizing the potential habitat benefits of the easement sites? (Y/N)	0	
8		Does the proposal target landscapes that are likely to result in the enrollment of multi-functional wetland ecosystems and diverse wetland types? Maximum of 20 points		
	5	Riparian Wetlands or Floodplains	0	
	5	Seasonal Marsh	0	
	5	Semi-permanent Marsh	0	
	5	Playa, Pothole, Vernal Pool, or other closed basin wetlands	0	
	5	Upland Nesting Cover/Oak Savannah	0	
	5	Forested Wetlands/Bottomland Hardwoods	0	
	5	Mudflats	0	
	5	Other (Tidal, Bog, Fen, Saline Overflow, etc.)	0	
			0	

Letter of Support from State Conservationist
 Additional Partner Support Included