Hearing Criteria

Proposals will be reviewed and scored by LSOHC members based on the following criteria. The scoring process will be used to help evaluate proposals and aid in the recommendation process. High scorers are not guaranteed funding and low scorers are not necessarily excluded from receiving funding.

HEARING CRITERIA	Max Points
1. Proposal abstract provides a clear and succinct overview of the proposal activity, outputs, and outcomes.	10
2. Proposal is clearly written and adequately addresses: Who, What, Where, When, Why, and How.	10
3. Proposal addresses habitats that have significant value for wildlife species of greatest conservation need, and/or threatened or endangered species.	10
4. Degree of timing/opportunistic urgency.	10
5. Proposal will leverage or expand corridors and/or complexes, and/or address habitat fragmentation.	10
6. Proposal outcomes will help address habitat climate resilience and will provide benefit to associated fish and wildlife species in a meaningful way.	10
7. Proposal addresses priority actions and outcomes of one or more of the ecological sections and is likely to produce and demonstrate significant and/or permanent conservation legacy and/or habitat outcomes for fish, game and wildlife.	10
8. Performance measures are clearly identified and have a specific plan for measuring and evaluating outcomes.	10
9. Proposal outcomes will be maintained over time.	10
10. Proposal includes leverage.	10
11. Proposed budget is appropriate to accomplish the outcomes described in the scope of work.	10
12. Proposal seems reasonable in its size (full score) or seems inflated to compensate for potential of reduced funding (low score).	10
Maximum Points Possible	**120**