

FISH GRANT APPLICATION EVALUATION



Project Name:	Amount Requested:
Ranking Number-in relation to other grants (1= the best, higher numbers=worse):	Reviewer Name:

Project Application Ranking Metrics:

Please use the following ranking criteria & feel free to add comments:

0= clearly no or insufficient information to judge	1= generally no, inadequate effort	2= Possibly with unresolved issues
3= primarily yes with some uncertainty	4= clearly yes	5= exceeds expectations

1. Is the project eligible for other sources of funding? (0 – information insufficient to tell, 1 – alternative sources of funding exist and redundant to FISH grant funds; 2 – alternative sources of funding exist, some leveraging of funds implied; 3 – alternative sources of funding exist and are clearly being leveraged to improve project, 4 – alternative funds exist, but FISH grant funds critical to overall success of the project; 5 – no alternative source of funding available.) **Select one: 0** Notes:
2. The project will reach a significant amount of people (0 = 0, 1 = 1-10, 2 = 11- 25, 3 = 26- 50, 4 = 51 - 100, 5 = > 100). **Select one: 0** Notes:
3. The project will affect a large area of District land (0 = < 1 ac., 1 = 1 – 5 ac., 2 = 6 – 10 ac., 3 = 11 – 15 ac. 4 = 16 – 25 ac. 5 = >25 ac.). **Select one: 0** Notes:
4. The post-project monitoring is informative and ensures the sustainability of the project. **Select one: 0** Notes:
5. The post-project maintenance is appropriate for sustaining the value of the project and ensures a high level and long term positive impact on District natural resources. **Select one: 0** Notes:
6. The project has appropriate partners involved (District = 3 + others = 1/each, Council, agencies, other landowners, etc. Maximum amount = 5). **Select one: 0** Notes:
7. The budget is cost effective/reasonable. **Select one: 0** Notes:
8. The project can realistically be completed within 24 months. **Select one: 0** Notes:

FISH GRANT



APPLICATION EVALUATION

9. The project meaningfully engages with, benefits and/or is led by communities of color. (0 – no mention of communities of color, 1 - communities of colors are mentioned, but no active role or benefit is described, 2 – communities of color are somewhat mentioned and a passive role described, 3 -- communities of color have a somewhat active role and some benefit described, 4 – significant active role and benefit to communities of colors, 5 – project is designed/led by and strongly benefits community of colors. **Select one: 0**
Notes:

10. Application is thorough and clear. **Select one: 0** Notes:

Additional Committee Questions/Comments:

Evaluation Score:	Notes:
Recommendation: <input type="checkbox"/> Fund <input type="checkbox"/> Do Not Fund <input type="checkbox"/> Resubmit with additional information on Comments on ways to improve the project:	