

Table 1. Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act Proposal Review Criteria

Management Significance and Relevancy to the Act				
Importance of Problem or Opportunity	Project Impact and Scale	Target Species/Habitats	Affects both Fish and Wildlife	General Project Merit For Each Criteria Level
Possible points = 12	Possible points = 12	Possible points = 12	Possible points = 4	Total Points 40
10-12 pts. - Project 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.	10-12 pts. - Project will result in large ecological benefits with broad regional/multistate or basin-wide implications.	10-12 pts. - Project focuses on a Federal or State threatened or endangered species OR project focuses on rare occurring habitat or habitat critical to the life cycle/function of a species.	4 - Project provides clear benefits to both fish AND wildlife communities.	Excellent
7-9 pts. - Project addresses a goal or general action(s) (i.e. a stated goal is to implement a type of action, without specific plans for specific projects) identified in a State, Tribal, or Federal management plan.	7-9 pts. - Project will result in large ecological benefits with local (not larger than a single lake or state) scale implications only.	7-9 pts. - Project focuses on a native species targeted for rehabilitation or a species of economic importance OR project focuses on habitat supporting the life cycle/function of a species.	3 - Project provides clear benefits to either fish OR wildlife communities.	Good
4-6 pts. - Project 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.	4-6 pts. - Project will result in small-medium ecological benefits with broad regional/multistate or basin-wide implications.	4-6 pts. - Project focuses on a native species not targeted by a specific rehabilitation plan or of economic importance OR project focuses on important (but not critical) habitat.	2 - Project provides clear benefits to specific fish AND wildlife populations	Fair
1-3 pts. - Project does not address an action(s) identified in a State, Tribal, or Federal management plan but has some value to resource managers.	1-3 pts. - Project will result in small-medium ecological benefits with local (not larger than a single lake or state) scale implications only.	1-3 pts. - Project focuses on a non-native species or of economic importance OR project focuses on abundant, less important habitat.	1 - Project provides clear benefits to specific fish OR wildlife populations	Sub-par
0 pts. - Project does not link to management plans or to any needs of resource managers.	0 - Project will result in minimal ecological benefits at any spatial level.	0- Project has no linkages to particular species or habitats of importance to resource managers.	0- Project has dubious value to any fish or wildlife species.	Poor

Project Characteristics				General Project Merit For Each Criteria Level
Objectives and Methods	Cost/Value (see footnotes at bottom)	Likelihood of Success	Potential for Negative Impacts	
Possible points = 12	Possible points = 12	Possible points = 12	Possible points = 4	Total Points 40
10-12 pts. - Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; methods are unique, innovative, and advance the state of knowledge in this area.	10-12 pts. - Project costs provide exceptional value for proposed work. (For habitat projects, unit costs are below target level.)	10-12 pts. - Proposed timeline is easily attainable and appropriate, applicants are very well qualified for proposed project and there are no anticipated impediments (e.g. permits, etc.) to implementation.	4 - There are no foreseeable negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, disease, contaminants, etc.) from this project.	Excellent
7-9 pts. - Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; methods are consistent with known standards and techniques.	7-9 pts. - Project costs provide very good value for proposed work. (For habitat projects, unit costs are below target level.)	7-9 pts. - Proposed timeline is acceptable, applicants are qualified for proposed project, and there are no apparent impediments (e.g. permits, etc.) to implementation.	3 - The project clearly and adequately addresses all potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.)	Good
4-6 pts. - Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; however, the methods need minor improvement to be consistent with known standards and techniques.	4-6 pts. - Project costs provide appropriate value for proposed work. (For habitat projects, unit costs are at target level.)	4-6 pts. - Proposed timeline is reasonable, but there is a serious impediment (e.g. qualification of applicants, permits, etc.) to implementation.	2 - The project vaguely or not adequately addresses potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.)	Fair
1-3 pts. - Proposed objectives are appropriate to address the problem; however, the methods are inconsistent with known standards and techniques.	1-3 pts. - Project costs are more costly than average for proposed work. (For habitat projects, unit costs are above target level.)	1-3 pts. - There are at least two barriers (e.g., time, qualification of applicants, permits, etc.) to implementation.	1 - The project does not address potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.).	Sub-par
0 - Proposed objectives and methods are inappropriate to address the problem and are inconsistent with known standards and techniques.	0 - Project costs are excessive and not appropriate for proposed work. (For habitat projects, unit costs are well above target level.)	0 - Proposed timeline is not reasonable and there are one or more probable barriers (e.g. qualification of applicants, permits, etc.) to implementation.	0 - Potential negative impacts (e.g. invasive species issues, contaminants, disease, etc.) clearly outweigh any positive benefits from this project.	Poor