MASSWILDLIFE HABITAT MANAGEMENT GRANT PROGRAM (MWHMGP) FY2025 HABITAT MANAGEMENT PROJECT RANKING CRITERIA WORKSHEET

PROJECT TITLE:

	Private Landowner Land Trust/NGO Municipal	
	CRITERIA	Rank
1	Project site protection status (maximum 15 points)	
2	Project map (maximum 10 points)	
3	Project budget (maximum 10 points)	
4	Net benefit of habitat enhancement activities to Species of Greatest Conservation Need as listed in the State Wildlife Action Plan (maximum 30 points)	
5	Net benefit of habitat enhancement activities to resilience of the habitat to climate change and overall climate adaptation (maximum 15 points)	
6	Landscape context (maximum 15 points)	
7	Project feasibility (maximum 25 points)	
8	Partnerships and outreach (maximum 10 points)	
9	Environmental Justice (maximum 15 points)	
	Total	

MWHMGP RANKING CRITERIA (TOTAL 145 POINTS)

(Points may be weighted by proportionally, at the discretion of the Ranking Committee, if different parcels, or portions of parcels, within the proposed project have different characteristics.)

- 1) MWHMGP Management Area's protection status:
 - Conservation restriction, Town Conservation Land, or other permanent conservation status under Article XCVII = 15 points
 - Agricultural Protection Restriction or private conservation organization ownership/restriction lacking Article XCVII protection = 10 points
 - Chapter 61/61A or 61B = 5 points
 - Other temporary protection including previous LIP covenant = 2 points
 - No protection = **ineligible for program**
- 2) Application map(s) is detailed showing the location of the parcel and identifies MWHMGP treatment units (areas of the parcel(s) that the proposed habitat management will occur) that correspond to the treatment units described in the application. Maps are provided at the appropriate scale for the treatment units and show the context of the site within the landscape. Shapefiles supplied when possible. Scale: 0-10 points.
 - Excellent: Maps have detailed locus and clearly outline MWHMGP treatment units; included maps are appropriately scaled, have detailed legends, and clearly delineate *both* the treatment units and the entire parcel. Management access routes into treatment units are shown, and the location of the property within the town(s) is clearly and accurately shown. Shapefiles supplied. = **10** points
 - Insufficient: Unable to determine the location of the project and/or location of treatment units as they are described in the application. = 0 points
- **3**) The proposed project budget is detailed, itemized, reasonable for the services provided; quotes provided for sub-contracted work; shows the cost and explanation of the work needed to achieve project goals. **Scale: 0-10 points.**
 - Detailed and itemized; quotes are included for sub-contracted work and costs are reasonable for proposed work. If NRCS rates are used, sufficient detail of the treatment unit habitat type(s) are provided, the work that is to be done is clearly specified, and the correct NRCS rate is selected. = 10 points
 - Insufficient budget information or proposed budget is unreasonable for the scope and scale of the proposed work. = 0 points (Earning 0 points on this criterion may result in the rejection of the entire application as MassWildlife reserves the right to reject all proposals, or portions of proposals, that it determines do not provide the best value overall to achieve the goals of the program.)
- 4) Net benefit to Species of Greatest Conservation Need as listed in the <u>State</u> <u>Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP)</u> species from the proposed habitat enhancement project. The grantee must provide an accurate list of SWAP species that will benefit from the proposed habitat enhancement activity, and the species must

benefit from the habitat type resulting from the proposed. Scale 0-25 points (plus potential bonus of up to 5 points):

- Habitat enhancement activities provide a high degree of net benefit to species that are on the SWAP list and applicant adequately described the direct connection between the habitat enhancement being conducted and the benefit to the identified species on the SWAP list. The scale of the proposed project management is at a size that is appropriate for the species being managed for. = 25 points
- Habitat enhancement activities provides no net benefit to species that are on the SWAP list, grantee fails to provide an accurate list of SWAP species that will benefit from the proposed habitat enhancement activity, applicant does not adequately describe the direct connection between the habitat enhancement being conducted and the identified species on the SWAP list, or the identified species do not occur in the area, does not rely on the habitat type being enhanced, or the scale of the proposed habitat management is not at the scale needed for the species. = 0 points
- Additional five (+5) points for projects that benefit Massachusetts Endangered, Threatened, or Special Concern species as listed in 321 CMR 10.90 at time of ranking.
- 5) Net benefit of habitat enhancement activities to resilience of the habitat to climate change and overall climate adaptation. **Scale 0-15 points:**
 - Habitat enhancement contributes highly to climate resilience based on the vulnerability of the habitat types to climate change and the anticipated benefits of the management actions = 15 points
 - No contribution to climate resilience= **0** points
- 6) Geographic and ecological landscape context of the proposed habitat project. The proposed project is complimentary to the surrounding landscape and within a region that is a high priority for conservation efforts. **Scale 1-15 points:**
 - Project is highly complementary to the surrounding landscape and in an area that is a high priority for the proposed conservation and habitat management activities. = 15 points
 - Project is not complementary to the local landscape and is not in an area that is a priority for conservation and habitat management activities = **0** points
- 7) Management objectives and tasks are likely to be achieved. Scale 0-25 points:
 - Proposed management objectives and tasks are likely to be achieved within the proposed project period and will meet stated habitat goals = 25 points
 - Proposed management objectives and tasks are unlikely to be achieved within the proposed project period = 0 points
- 8) The landowner has established ongoing, written partnership agreements with other organizations and/or individuals in the habitat management process to further enhance *both* habitat management efforts and public awareness of habitat benefits. The landowner fully describes the nature of these partnerships in relation to *both* the development of the current proposal and achieving public awareness following completion of the proposal. Scale 0-10 points:
 - The landowner has established written partnerships/collaborates with other organizations or individuals in the habitat management activities

described herein to *both* substantially enhance habitat management and public awareness of habitat benefits = 10 points

- The landowner has not established written partnerships/collaborates with other organizations or individuals in the habitat management activities described herein that resulted in significant enhancement to the habitat management or to public awareness of habitat benefits = 0 points
- 9) The project benefits an Environmental Justice (EJ) community as defined and mapped on the <u>Environmental Justice web page</u>. Points for this section are cumulative and will be determined by the ranking committee.
 - Treatment units are within, partially within, or within a half a mile (0.5 mi) of a "Minority" Environmental Justice community = **5** points
 - Treatment units are within, partially within, or within a half a mile (0.5 mi) of an "Income" Environmental Justice community = **5** points
 - Treatment units are within, partially within, or within a half a mile (0.5 mi) of an "Language Isolation" Environmental Justice community = **5** points
 - Treatment units are not within or near an Environmental Justice community = 0 points