

Western States Fire Managers WUI PROJECT PROPOSAL Scoring Aid FY 2022

All project proposals will be screened and evaluated based on the following Scoring Criteria. Only full point scores will be assigned; no zeros will be assigned. The maximum *total score* any one application can received is 45.

Eligibility Screening

Box 1: Application Information	Applicant must be the state/island forestry organization to be eligible.
Box 3: Budget	Applications over \$300,000 will be considered ineligible

Scoring Criteria

Box 4	5 pts – High	3-4 pts – Medium	1-2 pts - Low
Budget Narrative	Well written. Budget is complete, easy to understand, and budget items are clearly labeled. Narrative provides clear and concise explanation of each budget line item and its function within the project. All numbers align with Box 3. Match is not considered in this box, as it is addressed in Box 9.	Budget items are present and align with Box 3, but one or more budget line items lacks explanation and function within project.	Major errors in budget calculations. Expenditures and budget line item functions are unclear. Poorly written.
<p>1 point deductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Minor error in budget calculations ▪ Somewhat unclear on how expenditures activities tie to project goals <p>2-3 point deductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Major errors in budget numbers ▪ Unclear on expenditures and budget item functions ▪ Poorly written 			

Box 5	5 pts – High	3-4 pts – Medium	1-2 pts - Low
Project Area Description and Challenges	Provides well-written introduction of the project area, project type, and why need exists in the area.	Applicant describes project area and project type but misses one or two elements such as fuel type, hazards, challenges, or need for project work.	Poorly written project area description; does not include issues/problems or challenges facing the project area; does not clearly exhibit the need for the project.
Fuels	Narrative clearly captures fuel type/vegetation, specific hazards, and challenges the project seeks to address. Project will reduce hazardous fuels in WUI communities or in a landscape that if affected by fire, would adversely impact the community.		
Outreach/Prevention	Outreach/prevention activities (if any) are relevant to the project and clearly describe how outreach is addressing challenges that are impacting current efforts.	Outreach/prevention activities are outlined but does not clearly address challenges	Mentioned but not specifically described.
CWPP, Planning, Assessment, Monitoring	CWPP activities (if any) are relevant to the project and described. General results of planning efforts are described.	Objective and goals of CWPP not clear	Mentioned but not specifically described.

- 1 point deductions:
- Project type described, but unclear, *or*
 - Vegetation and fuels described, but unclear, *or*
 - WUI community/challenges described, but unclear
- 2-3 point deductions:
- Project type not described
 - CWPP Updates are not included (if part of the project)
 - Outreach/education not included (if part of the project)
 - Vegetation and fuel type not addressed/ unclear
 - WUI community /challenges not addressed
 - Poorly written

Box 6	5 pts – High	3-4 – Medium	1-2 pts – Low
<p>Relation to Forest Action Plan and CWPP</p>	<p>Clearly describes specific goals of CWPP <i>and</i> FAP and how project elements/scope integrate those goals. Narrative well written and organized. If no CWPP exists, project discusses CWPP development and relation to the FAP</p> <p>Outreach/prevention activities (if any) are relevant to the project and described clearly and the general impact of education/outreach addressing CWPP and FAP goals that are impacting current efforts.</p> <p>CWPP activities (if any) are relevant to the project and described. General results of planning efforts are described</p>	<p>Covers required elements but does not explicitly or clearly describe relation of the project to FAP and CWPP.</p> <p>Outreach/prevention activities are outlined but does not clearly address challenges</p> <p>Objective and goals of CWPP not clear</p>	<p>Poorly written. Does not include how this project fits into the broad goals of the FAP or how it meets the goals and objectives of the CWPP</p> <p>Mentioned but not specifically described.</p> <p>Mentioned but not specifically described.</p>

- 1 point deductions:
- Project includes relation to FAP, and CWPP, but is does not fully describe linkage to specific goals in those documents
- 2-3 point deductions:
- Describes relation to FAP or CWPP, but not both
 - Narrative mentions planning documents, but does not describe how the project aligns with them
 - Poorly written

Box 7	10 pts – High	6-9 pts – Medium	1-5 pts – Low
<p>Proposed Activities</p> <p>Fuels Projects Not all sample deliverables need to be present. Applicant should use the appropriate metric in describing the project.</p> <p>Outreach/Prevention Not all sample deliverables need to be present. Applicant should use the appropriate metric in describing the project.</p> <p>CWPP, Planning, Assessment, Monitoring Not all sample deliverables need to be present. Applicant should use the appropriate metric in describing the project.</p>	<p>General: Applicant provides a clear and well-organized narrative that explains the activities (fuels, cost-share, outreach, prevention, planning) to take place and how they will be completed (i.e. scope of work or prescription). Narrative is target and metric-oriented and lists specific deliverables corresponding to each activity. Narrative demonstrates that activities have been planned with forethought, during preparation of the application. Describes project activities and how grant funds and leveraged resources (not match) will be used.</p> <p>Sample deliverables for fuels projects: Acres, fuel break size, what vegetation is being removed, target dbh for removal, tree crown spacing etc., method of treatment (via handwork, mechanical treatment etc.)</p> <p>Sample Deliverables for education/prevention projects: Describe who will be targeted (communities), how many will be targeted and <u>the need</u> for education/ outreach and include the use of established fire program elements (Firewise, community outreach prevention programs, Living with Fire, defensible space etc.); project should also describe the use of workshops, presentations, handouts and brochures etc.</p> <p>Sample Deliverables for CWPP Update Projects: Clearly describe accomplishments to this point (for new CWPP's, demonstrate need), opportunities for collaboration, goals of fuels reduction priorities, how structural ignitability will be addressed. Development of new CWPP also satisfies this criteria.</p>	<p>Missing a key metric that would logically be assumed with specific activities OR describes project activities and how grant funds and leveraged resources will be used, but lacks detail. Project deliverables and outputs are described, though how success is measured for one or two activities is unclear. For lower range of medium-tier scores, narrative provides specific activities but outcomes are vague.</p>	<p>Insufficient detail is provided as to what work will be completed using grant funds and leveraged resources (not match). Does not include measurable elements, how many acres to be mitigated, what was being mitigated (veg), or how the proposed activities were being completed. Poorly written.</p>

<p>1 point deduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project activities described, but minor lack of clarity <p>2-4 point deduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrative lists deliverables and/or metrics with each activity description, but some activities are vaguely described or unclear Unclear who is responsible for each aspect (homeowners, contractors, project managers, etc.) Prescription described, but generic or unclear Missing one or two key metrics that would logically be assumed with specific activities, i.e. acres treated, cost per acre, number of citizens to be reached, etc. Narrative and associated deliverables are mostly clear. <p>5 or more point deduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Narrative and associated deliverables are not well-described and most logical metrics are missing from activities Narrative omits description of one or more essential project activities Poorly written

Box 8	5 pts – High	3-4 pts – Medium	1-2 pts – Low
Landscape Impacts	<p>Well written. Narrative clearly demonstrates forethought given to project orientation or scope/magnitude of positive impact on a landscape/community beyond the defined project area.</p> <p>Explain how the project complements or enhances those by other agencies or groups and ties into a greater landscape or community goal of other projects, and how it impacts past, current and future projects.</p>	<p>Landscape level activities or community reach are described in general or other nearby projects are listed, but it is not clear how or why the project complements them directly at a landscape or community level.</p>	<p>Narrative not clearly written; key descriptions of landscape level activities and overall project impact are absent.</p>

<p>1 point deduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community-wide protection or landscape-level impact is evident, but complementary activities though mentioned are not specified <p>2-3 point deduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project occurs over a broad landscape, but does not sufficiently demonstrate contiguity No complementary projects are mentioned
--

Box 9	5 pts High	3-4 pts Medium	1-2 pts Low
Project Collaboration	All partner contributions are listed and described as relevant to project success. Narrative clearly demonstrates commitment from multiple stakeholders and/or on-going multi-partner collaboration. Describes all match contributions listed in Box 3.	Lists partners and contributions, but specific roles are unclear or lacking detail, or match origin is mentioned but unclear.	Very little or no collaboration appears to exist. The project does not appear to have a cross-boundary impact.

1 point deductions:

- Project partners listed, but contributions of one or two are ambiguous.

2-3 point deductions:

- Project collaborators lack specificity and clarity
- Match contributions are not described
- Multiple, undefined acronyms
- Poorly written and organized

Note: The allocated grant amount must be matched in full and along program authorities by the recipient using **non-federally funded sources**, except as authorized for the Insular Areas in 48USC1469a and Amendment of Subsection (d); Insular Areas refers to the Pacific Islands and Territories. Matching requirements for dollars awarded through the competitive allocation process may be met through consolidation as currently handled through consolidated payment grants. Title 3 funds are considered ‘non-federal’ when used to match WUI competitive grant funds.

Box 10	5 pts – High	3-4pts – Medium	1-2 pts - Low
Project Timeline	Project timeline is organized and has clearly established beginning and end dates, project milestones, and specific targets completed at specific times.	Organized as an easy-to-follow timeline of events, but missing one or two required elements such as milestones or accomplishment markers.	Provides beginning and end dates, but no milestones or timeline of specific deliverables. Has a flavor of “give us the money, we’ll tell you how we spent it.”

1 point deductions:

- Minor lack of clarity or specificity in deliverables, targets, or milestones

2-3 point deductions:

- No milestones
- No begin end/dates
- Poorly written

Box 11	5 pts-High	3-4 pts-Medium	1-2 pts-Low
<p>Project Sustainability</p> <p><i>Fuels</i></p> <p><i>Outreach/Prevention</i></p> <p><i>CWPP, Planning, Assessment, Monitoring</i></p>	<p>Narrative is well-written and discusses four main points (environment, education, commitment and monitoring). Clearly shows that items described have been planned in advance and/or have had past success. Describes who is responsible for maintenance, for how long, and if any processes or long-term plans are in place to support project after grant is spent. Each one of the 4 requirements is worth 1 point, plus one point for mechanisms which strengthen maintenance beyond life of the grant (landowner agreement, HOA or municipal regulations, technical support from local agencies)</p> <p>Narrative is well-written and discusses three main points (education, commitment and monitoring). How will outreach/education/prevention be distributed? What is the commitment over time? For monitoring purposes application describes how outreach will be sustained and updated over the course of time</p> <p>Narrative is well-written and discusses three main points (education, commitment and monitoring). Should discuss main points as above for education but should discuss how CWPP will be used over time.</p>	<p>Addresses all four categories but is missing key descriptive elements required for 4 points OR is missing one required element but is otherwise well-written and descriptive.</p> <p>Addresses all three categories but is missing key descriptive elements required for 3 points OR is missing one required element but is otherwise well-written and descriptive.</p> <p>Addresses all three categories but is missing key descriptive elements required for 3 points OR is missing one required element but is otherwise well-written and descriptive</p>	<p>Omits multiple required elements and/or is poorly detailed and unclear.</p> <p>Omits multiple required elements and/or is poorly detailed and unclear</p> <p>Omits multiple required elements and/or is poorly detailed and unclear</p>
<p>1 point deductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Missing one of four elements ▪ No mechanism in place to ensure follow-through beyond grant <p>2-3 point deductions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Missing key descriptive elements ▪ Generic milestones or milestones missing altogether ▪ Poorly written 			