

**Atlantic Coastal Fish Habitat Partnership
FY15 Project Evaluation Form**

Project Name	
Project Location (State, County, City, and Congressional District)	
ACFHP Subregion	
Name of Organization Requesting Funds	
Project Officer	
USFWS Contact	
Project Type	___Construction ___Design ___Planning ___Monitoring ___Outreach
Funding	Amount Requested: _____ Total Cost: _____
Eligible?	
Total Score (formula)	

Would you recommend this project for ACFHP funding or other potential funding sources?
yes___ no___ If no, why not?

I. ELIGIBILITY	yes or no
<p><u>Important Note:</u> Funds appropriated to the USFWS for implementation of the Action Plan may not be expended on ineligible activities per the checklist below. If any of these activities is integral to the project, the project may only use funds from other sources to support those specific activities. However, those funds or previously expended funds may qualify as matching funds for the project. (see USFWS - National Fish Habitat Action Plan - 717 FW 1, Sections 1.8(C) & (D) - 2009)</p>	
<p>A. Are actions under the project required by existing regulatory programs, court order, or decree? (Note: Funds may support activities under voluntary agreements that exceed regulatory requirements for conserving habitats.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes = ineligible for funding No = eligible for funding</p>	
<p>B. Will funding requested from ACFHP be used to pay costs incurred for the project before the award was granted (e.g. previous expenditures for costs such as preliminary designs, surveys, appraisals, etc.)? (Note: Previous expenditures may qualify as in-kind match, including federal and non-federal funding used for eligible direct and indirect costs.(see 1.8 A, B & C in the guidance document)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes = ineligible No = eligible</p>	
<p>C. Will funds requested from ACFHP for this project be used for realty costs associated with the project (e.g., lease or purchase interests in real property or to make rental or other land use incentive payments to landowners)?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes = ineligible No = eligible</p>	
<p>D. Does the funding requested from ACFHP for this project involve the operation or maintenance of facilities, buildings or similar structures? (Note: This does not apply to the maintenance or construction of earthen structures.)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes = ineligible No = eligible</p>	
<p>E. Is the project primarily a research study? (Note: Only evaluation of the biological response to an on-the-ground project may be eligible per 1.8A5).</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes = ineligible No = eligible</p>	
<p>F. Does the funding requested from ACFHP for this project include incentive payments (Annual payments to encourage participation (e.g. some NRCS farm bill programs))?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes = ineligible No = eligible</p>	

II. TECHNICAL AND SCIENTIFIC MERIT	Reviewer Score
<p>A. Is the project’s technical design adequate to achieve the proposed outcomes?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">yes no</p>	
<p>B. Does the project make use of the best available science and technology?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">yes no</p>	
<p>C. Is the project likely to meet all federal, state, and local permits within the proposed implementation schedule and is the proposed implementation schedule adequate to achieve the proposed outcomes?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">yes no</p>	
<p>D. Will the monitoring and evaluation plan provide sufficient data and analysis (e.g. acres restored or stream miles opened for fish passage) to determine if the proposed outcomes were achieved?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">yes no</p>	
III. OUTREACH AND EDUCATION	Reviewer Score
<p>A. The extent to which the project will disseminate information on fish habitat conservation to increase awareness and transfer knowledge on lessons learned</p> <p style="text-align: center;">significant (eg. Congressional visits, online tools, community event) moderate (eg. Presentations to community/posters at conferences) low (eg. project summary report made publically available)</p>	
IV. ACFHP PRIORITIES	Reviewer Score
<p>A. Does the project support or address an ACFHP sub-regional priority habitat? (score only one region)</p>	
<i>North Atlantic</i>	
<p>Riverine Bottom</p> <p style="text-align: right;">supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat</p>	
<p>Marine and Estuarine Shellfish Beds</p> <p style="text-align: right;">supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat</p>	
<p>Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (meso to polyhaline)</p> <p style="text-align: right;">supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat</p>	
<i>Mid-Atlantic</i>	
<p>Riverine Bottom</p> <p style="text-align: right;">supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat</p>	

Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat	
Tidal Vegetation	supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat	
South Atlantic		
Marine and Estuarine Shellfish Beds	supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat	
Riverine Bottom	supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat	
Tidal Vegetation	supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat	
South Florida		
Coral and live / hardbottom	supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat	
Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (meso- to polyhaline)	supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat	
Mangrove	supports or addresses priority habitat does not address priority habitat	
B. Does the project support or address an ACFHP fish habitat but not one that is a priority for the subregion in which the project is located?		
	supports or addresses an ACFHP fish habitat type(s) not identified as a priority does not address an ACFHP fish habitat	
C. Does the project address one or more of the ACFHP habitat protection or habitat restoration objectives described in the draft conservation strategy?		
<i>Habitat Protection Objectives</i>		
Protection Objective 1: Ensure adequate and effective fish movement past existing or potential barriers to maintain connectivity within Subregional Priority Habitats.		high medium low does not meet objective
Protection Objection 2: Maintain or improve water quality and hydrology in Subregional Priority Habitats that are currently functioning, through incorporation of BMPs and/or technological controls.		

	<p>high medium low does not meet objective</p>
<p>Protection Objective 3: Define the water flows and volumes needed to sustain the structure and function of healthy aquatic ecosystems (including groundwater and surface water interactions, maintaining appropriate salinity regimes) and ameliorate consumptive water usage where detrimental to Subregional Priority Habitats.</p>	<p>high medium low does not meet objective</p>
<p>Protection Objective 4: Minimize or reduce adverse impacts to Subregional Priority Habitats associated with coastal development and water dependent activities (e.g. recreational boating, and marine transportation).</p>	<p>high medium low does not meet objective</p>
<p>Protection Objective 5: Maintain or increase the resiliency of Subregional Priority Habitats to the impacts of climate change.</p>	<p>high medium low does not meet objective</p>
<p>Protection Objective 6: Increase public awareness of the threats facing Subregional Priority Habitats and the protection measures available to avoid and minimize those threats.</p>	<p>high medium low does not meet objective</p>
<p><i>Habitat Restoration Objectives</i></p>	
<p>Restoration Objective 1: Restore and enhance hydrological or physical connections between Subregional Priority Habitats to promote fish utilization and improve overall aquatic health.</p>	<p>high medium low does not meet objective</p>

<p>Restoration Objective 2: Restore Subregional Priority Habitats, such as replanting eelgrass beds or restoring oyster beds, in locations where threats have been minimized or removed (does not include dam or other barrier removal).</p>	<p>high medium low does not meet objective</p>
<p>Restoration Objective 3: Restore water quality in areas where it has degraded or eliminated Subregional Priority Habitats.</p>	<p>high medium low does not meet objective</p>
<p>Restoration Objective 4: Maintain or increase the resiliency of Subregional Priority Habitats to the impacts of climate change through restoration activities.</p>	<p>high medium low does not meet objective</p>
<p>D. Is the project located in a priority area identified in an approved state or federal management plan? (e.g. State Wildlife Action Plan, state or federal recovery plan, or National Estuary Program CCMP)</p> <p>project is located in a priority area identified in an approved state or federal management plan project is not located in a priority area identified in an approved state or federal management plan</p>	
<p>E. Will the project address a root cause and contribute to a long-term self-sustaining solution to the problem(s) described?</p>	<p>high medium low no</p>
<p>F. Does the project address the habitat needs of trust species? (Note: trust species include species managed under a Federal Fishery Management Plan or by the Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission, tribal trust fish resources, fish species within Fish and Wildlife Service lands, anadromous and catadromous fishes, other interjurisdictional fishes and aquatic species, endangered, threatened, candidate, or proposed species federally listed under the Endangered Species Act)</p>	<p>yes</p>

	no	
G. Are there direct social or economic benefits of the project ? (i.e. Social and economic benefits include providing new opportunities for recreational fishing, improving fishing and boating access, or markedly increasing commercial fishing harvest)	yes no	
V. QUALIFICATIONS OF APPLICANT		Reviewer Score
A. Does the applicant (and associated personnel) have the technical capacity/knowledge to conduct the scope and scale of the proposed project?	yes no	
VI. PROJECT COSTS		Reviewer Score
A. Does the project have the greatest cost effectiveness and a high likelihood of being completed within the specified budget? [GOOD CHECKLIST ITEM: Is the budget realistic, sufficiently detailed, with appropriate budget breakdown and justification?]	yes no	
B. Does the project leverage other investment by maximizing partner funding (in-kind and cash contributions) to support implementation?	Greater than 2:1 partner funding 1:1 or greater than 1:1 partner funding less than 1:1 partner funding	
C. Are multiple groups, such as federal and state agencies, local governments, NGOs, academics, or tribal governments participating in the development and execution of the project?	more than one partner involved one or no partners involved	