

# Guidelines for Applicant Priority Ranking Form

## 2014 Community Family Forest (CFF) Grant Program

NDFS Feb 2014

### Minimum Requirements:

Projects which fulfill the following minimum requirements are presented for grant consideration. Each grant application is screened for minimum requirements prior to submission to the Grant Review Committee for ranking.

1. Nine (9) copies of the completed Grant Application
2. Nine (9) copies of photos, vicinity maps and design plans of proposed project
3. Name of NDFS Community Forestry Personnel Contacted
4. Provided Legal Land Description for Project

### Ranking Criteria:

Projects will be rated according to the quality of the application as a whole and how well the specified ranking criteria are addressed. The committee will score from 0-10 for each criterion:

#### **RANKING REQUIREMENTS**

[10 Excellent] [7-9 Good] [4-6 Fair] [1-3 Poor] [0 Unacceptable]

#### **1. Project Description, Purpose, Need and Scope**

- Excellent: Project is thoroughly described, leaving no doubt as to intention of project. Narrative indicates a well-planned project.
- Good: Similar to above, but narrative could provide more detail.
- Fair: Project intent is stated, but narrative description limited, leaving some questions regarding certain aspects of the project.
- Poor: Project intent is vague and poorly planned. Planning appears to have been an afterthought.
- Unacceptable: Project intent is not stated. Narrative does not have specific project focus. Serious doubt as to whether applicant could successfully implement this project.

#### **2. Public Access**

- Excellent: Project is accessible, free of charge to the general public. Beneficial and accessible to wide range of publics for multiple uses, including visual, physical, and social.
- Good: Project accessible, free of charge, but accessible to fewer members of the public or for fewer uses.
- Fair: Project is accessible to general public, but for a fee, community still benefits due to project location.
- Poor: Project accessible to general public, but for a fee.
- Unacceptable: Project is not accessible to the general public.

### **3. Project Innovation / Community Benefits**

- Excellent: Project is unique to the community and/or provides three (3) or more types of benefits, such as economic development, entrance beautification, wildlife enhancement, outdoor classroom, screening, or other benefits identified by community.
- Good: Project is unique to community and/or provides at least two (2) types of benefits.
- Fair: Project is not necessarily innovative or unique but provides at least one type of benefits to the community.
- Poor: Project is not unique to the community and its benefits are questionable.
- Unacceptable: Project provides no obvious community benefits.

### **4. Project Personnel**

- Excellent: Thorough description of all personnel related to the project, includes narrative listing name, position title, and work experience relating to tree planting and care.
- Good: Similar to above, but work experience relating to tree planting and care could be described in more detail.
- Fair: Personnel listed have tree planting and care experience, but narrative does not summarize their role in project or their experience.
- Poor: Personnel listed have no apparent background in tree planting or care.
- Unacceptable: No personnel listed.

### **5. Use of Volunteers**

- Excellent: Project provides a clear definition of the number of volunteers and the tasks they will be expected to carry out includes a diversity of volunteer groups.
- Good: Same as above but less diversity of volunteers.
- Fair: Number of volunteers is not clear or appears inadequate. Tasks are indicated but may lack detail.
- Poor: Volunteers will be involved, but number and tasks not clear.
- Unacceptable: Volunteers not included as part of project

### **6. Project Planning and Implementation (Project Schedule and Plan of Action)**

- Excellent: Thorough description of how the project will be implemented. Includes a detailed plan of work and timetable indicating approximately when each activity will be carried out and project completed.
- Good: Similar to above but may lack timetable, tasks that need to be completed or other minor information.
- Fair: Includes a project implementation description, but lacks detail and timetable.
- Poor: Project implementation plan and timetable is vague. Project will probably get done, but planning appears to be lacking.
- Unacceptable: Project implementation plan is unrealistic or nonexistent. Doubtful that project will be completed.

## 7. Species Selection (Plant Materials)

It is in the long term interest of communities to increase the genetic diversity of the trees planted. This can be done by planting multiple genera, and species within these genera.

(Examples of genera: Oak - *Quercus*, Birch - *Betula*, Linden – *Tilia*; Examples of species: American Linden - *Tilia americana*, Littleleaf Linden - *Tilia cordata*)

Excellent:	Five (5) or more tree species which are appropriate for the site.
Good:	Four (4) or more tree species which are appropriate for the site
Fair:	Three (3) tree species which are appropriate for the site.
Poor:	Two (2) tree species which are appropriate for the site.
Unacceptable:	No species or only one species (monoculture) indicated.

## 8. Project Budget

Excellent:	Project budget leaves no doubt that the associated costs are adequate and realistic to complete the project. The amount and type of match meet the project requirements.
Good:	Similar to above, but less detail.
Fair:	Some questions regarding the use of budget funds, though still a good project.
Poor:	Vague detail as to the use of budget funds.
Unacceptable:	Poor justification for utilization of funds.

## 9. Project Design Plan/Vicinity Map/Photos

Excellent:	Application includes vicinity map showing location of project within the community/area. Design plan is drawn to scale. Plan shows where each tree will be located and identifies each location by tree species. Plan includes a plant materials list summarizing species, size, and quantity. Photo or show project site and reveal need for the project.
Good:	Similar to above, but vicinity map, designs plan, or photos could be improved.
Fair:	This is the highest rating available for applications lacking either photos or a vicinity map, but containing a design plan.
Poor:	Design plan not to scale. Locations of proposed trees are vague and do not specify species. Plan indicates the project, but very poorly. Design plan located on vicinity map.
Unacceptable:	No design plan and no indication of one.