

Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act Review Criteria
Used to evaluate management significance and relevancy to the Act and proposal characteristics.

Criteria & Scoring Rubric I	10-12 points	7-9 points	4-6 points	1-3 points	0 points
Importance of Problem or Opportunity	Proposal directly addresses a specific management objective or task identified in a State, Tribal, or Federal management plan OR addresses a critically important emerging need as recognized by State, Tribal, or Federal Agencies.	Proposal addresses a goal or general action(s) (i.e. a stated goal is to implement a type of action, without specific plans for specific proposals) identified in a State, Tribal, or Federal management plan.	Proposal addresses the vision or a broad, far reaching action(s) (i.e. a stated goal is to restore a species or to restore watershed health) identified in a State, Tribal, or Federal management plan.	Proposal does not address an action(s) identified in a State, Tribal, or Federal management plan but has some value to resource managers.	Proposal does not link to management plans or to any needs of resource managers.
Management Implications	Proposal has very high probability of positively influencing species population trends (habitat proposals) or of providing actionable management applications that will directly benefit the resource (research proposals).	Proposal has moderately high probability of positively influencing species population trends (habitat proposals) or of providing actionable management applications that will directly benefit the resource (research proposals).	Proposal has moderate probability of positively influencing species population trends (habitat proposals) or of providing actionable management applications that will directly benefit the resource (research proposals).	Proposal is unlikely to produce meaningful benefits for species population trends (habitat proposals) or is unlikely to provide actionable management applications that will directly benefit the resource (research proposals).	Proposal is very unlikely to produce meaningful benefits for species population trends (habitat proposals) or is very unlikely to provide actionable management applications that will directly benefit the resource (research proposals).
Project Impact and Scale	Proposal will result in large ecological benefits with broad regional/multistate or basin-wide implications.	Proposal will result in large ecological benefits with local (not larger than a single lake or state) scale implications only.	Proposal will result in small-medium ecological benefits with broad regional/multistate or basin-wide implications.	Proposal will result in small-medium ecological benefits with local (not larger than a single lake or state) scale implications only.	Proposal will result in minimal ecological benefits at any spatial level.
Target Species/Habitats	Proposal focuses on a Federal or State threatened or endangered species OR proposal focuses on rare occurring habitat or habitat critical to the life cycle/function of a species.	Proposal focuses on a native species targeted for rehabilitation or a species of economic importance OR proposal focuses on habitat supporting the life cycle/function of a species.	Proposal focuses on a native species not targeted by a specific rehabilitation plan or of economic importance OR proposal focuses on important (but not critical) habitat.	Proposal focuses on a non-native species or of economic importance OR proposal focuses on abundant, less important habitat.	Proposal has no linkages to particular species or habitats of importance to resource managers.
Objectives and Methods	Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; methods are unique, innovative, and advance the state of knowledge in this area.	Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; methods are consistent with known standards and techniques.	Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; however, the methods need minor improvement to be consistent with known standards and techniques.	Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; however, the methods are inconsistent with known standards and techniques.	Proposed objectives and methods are inappropriate to address the problem and are inconsistent with known standards and techniques.
Cost/Value	Proposal costs provide exceptional value for proposed work. (For habitat proposals, unit costs are below target level.)	Proposal costs provide very good value for proposed work. (For habitat proposals, unit costs are below target level.)	Proposal costs provide appropriate value for proposed work. (For habitat proposals, unit costs are at target level.)	Proposal costs are more costly than average for proposed work. (For habitat proposals, unit costs are above target level.)	Proposal costs are excessive and not appropriate for proposed work. (For habitat proposals, unit costs are well above target level.)
Likelihood of Success	Proposed timeline is easily attainable and appropriate, applicants are very well qualified for proposed proposal and there are no anticipated impediments (e.g. permits, etc.) to implementation.	Proposed timeline is acceptable, applicants are qualified for proposed proposal, and there are no apparent impediments (e.g. permits, etc.) to implementation.	Proposed timeline is reasonable, but there is a serious impediment (e.g. qualification of applicants, permits, etc.) to implementation.	There are at least two barriers (e.g., time, qualification of applicants, permits, etc.) to implementation.	Proposed timeline is not reasonable and there are one or more probable barriers (e.g. qualification of applicants, permits, etc.) to implementation.

Criteria and Scoring Rubric II	4 points	3 points	2 points	1 point	0 points
Affects both Fish and Wildlife	Proposal provides clear benefits to both fish AND wildlife communities.	Proposal provides clear benefits to either fish OR wildlife communities.	Proposal provides clear benefits to specific fish AND wildlife populations.	Proposal provides clear benefits to specific fish OR wildlife populations.	Proposal has dubious value to any fish or wildlife species.
Potential for Negative Impacts	Proposal has no foreseeable negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, disease, contaminants, etc.).	Proposal clearly and adequately addresses all potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.).	Proposal vaguely or not adequately addresses potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.).	Proposal does not address potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.).	Potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.) clearly outweigh any positive benefits from this proposal.