

Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative- FY 2010 Funding Recommendations

Prepared by: GNLCC Advisory Team on May 14, 2010; Revised on June 10, 2010; Finalized July 6 2010 (see additional projects listed on Table 1)

As per direction from the Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative (GNLCC) Steering Committee meeting on April 21, 2010, the GNLCC Advisory Team has developed the recommendations described in Table 1 for use of \$850K of GNLCC funds in Fiscal Year 2010.

See amended Table 2 with additional projects attached.

Science Needs Assessment

From November 2009 until April 2010, GNLCC Interim Coordinator began working with interested individuals from other agencies including USGS, NPS, USFS and BLM as per their willingness to participate, in what organically developed into a GNLCC Advisory Team. Participation was open to those interested. A preliminary science needs assessment, based on input from webinar surveys, ongoing workshops, meetings and review of existing science assessments from partners and partnerships, resulted in the following thematic categories of science and information needs:

- Land Cover Data and Information
- Climate Information
- Data Sharing, Integration and Management
- Habitat Connectivity
- Vulnerability Assessments (emphasis on Water Resources)
- Biological Monitoring and Evaluation

Solicitation of Proposals

As a next step, existing landscape and resource-based partnerships within the Great Northern geographic area were asked about their ongoing science and information efforts and needs within these categories. Specific proposals were solicited in response to the above identified efforts that were either 1) ongoing landscape partnership efforts or 2) a need directly identified by a landscape partnership.

On April 21, the GNLCC Steering Committee narrowed the emphasis for FY10 to the following 3 thematic categories:

- Water Resource Vulnerability Assessments
- Data Sharing, Integration and Management
- Habitat Connectivity

In addition, the Steering Committee agreed to accept additional proposals if they were 'shovel-ready' and fit into the above categories. The Steering Committee further agreed to use a draft criteria developed by the Advisory Team with suggested weighting from the Steering Committee (below).

Proposal Review

The Advisory Team met on April 22 to accomplish 2 assignments:

- 1) draft a governance document in response to Steering Committee deliberations and direction
- 2) review proposals and develop a FY10 funding recommendation for the Steering Committee

During April 22, the following process was agreed to:

- Current and newly submitted proposals would be screened to ensure they are:
 - Shovel-ready

- Addressed elements under at least 1 of the 3 prioritized thematic categories
- A Review Team of 4 Advisory Team members would rank proposals according to the weighted criteria
- The Advisory Team would convene to review rankings and develop a funding recommendation for the Steering Committee by May 14, 2010.

Final Recommendation

Overall 14 proposals were deemed to fit into the 3 thematic categories and were reviewed by the Review Team according to criteria with weighting. Each of the 4 reviewers conducted an independent evaluation of each of the 14 proposals. Individual rankings were then compiled and averaged. The rankings were in general agreement in ranks and scores. After scores were compiled, the Advisory Team came together for a final evaluation to develop this recommendation. The final evaluation included an assessment of individual proposal costs in light of potential effectiveness, proposal work elements, deliverables, and matching funds. Based on that evaluation, the Advisory team generated a revised and recommended “award” amount for each proposal. (see Table 1.)

Amended Process written June 10, 2010

During the May 17 Steering Committee Conference Call, Steve Guertin, Regional Director of Mountain-Prairie Region of US Fish and Wildlife Service offered \$250K to be added to the original amount. In addition, the Northern Rockies Science Center contributed \$100K.

At the recommendation of the Steering Committee, the Advisory Team added 2 projects from the list of ranked proposals which included projects up to a natural break point at 4 (out of 6 total). The Steering Committee agreed that any additional funds would be used to complete budgets from the top of the list working down. Therefore the Advisory Team was able to complete a funding recommendation as attached in Table 1. Please see Appendix A. FY10 Work plan Tracking Results spreadsheet for more information.

Draft Criteria with Steering Committee Weighting (% weighting)

1) Relevance to climate change or other landscape drivers (25%)

Potential Criteria. Does the project proposal:

- i) Adequately frame the “project” actions relative to improving our understanding of how species, habitats, and/or landscapes may respond to altered climatic or other changed conditions?
- ii) Articulate that “project” products will provide management/conservation scenarios relative to altered climatic or other changed conditions?

2) Relevance of the project to focal resources, species and/or habitats in the GNLCC (15%)

Potential Criteria. Does the project proposal:

- i) Address or articulate resource, species or habitat relationships?
- ii) Articulate relationships with larger (i.e., continental, regional) conservation plans/goals/priorities?
- iii) Provide quantifiable measures of project performance on either the resources, species (i.e., population) or habitat/landscape?

3) Relevance to on-the-ground conservation delivery (25%)

Potential Criteria. Does the project proposal:

- i) Allow for more effective conservation delivery? How?
- ii) Provide information to address conservation actions? How?
- iii) Inform or prioritize conservation delivery actions or locales in the near future?
- iv) Provide information applicable to decision-making for a resource, throughout a habitat, or for a species in a large portion of the LCC?

4) Geographic scope of project (10%)

Potential Criteria. Does the project proposal:

- i) Include focal landscapes/habitats identified in continental or regional conservation plans or by partner groups/agencies? This will be important for effective delivery of any project product.
- ii) Share geographic boundaries with other LCCs or other administrative conservation boundaries (e.g., Joint Ventures, States)? If so, have potential logistical and administrative constraints been addressed?

5) Partner engagement (15%)

Potential Criteria. Does the project proposal:

- i) Articulate “project” benefits for all partners and other programs that share trust resources and geographic boundaries?
- ii) Engage or catalyze a broad partner base including federal, state, local, NGO, and private or corporate support (support = in-kind and/or monetary)?
- iii) Engage “new” partners?
- iv) \$\$ leverage ratio

6) Ability to show "success" in FY2010 (10%)

Potential Criteria: Does the project proposal:

- i) ensure success in FY10 through a clearly articulated outcome and high confidence in completion and application to conservation delivery goals.

Table 1. Funding Recommendations for FY2010

Proposal Title	Sponsoring Organization	Principle Investigator	Funding Need Identified(\$Ks)	Rank*	Funding Final (\$Ks) 6/10
The Washington Connected Landscapes Project, Part I: Supporting Connectivity Conservation Now and Under Future Climates	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	McAllister et al.	304	5.16	304
Development of a Transboundary Decision Support System to Guide and Implement Conservation, Land Use, Energy, Transportation, and Climate Change Management and Monitoring.	Idaho Fish and Game	G. Servheen et al.	135	4.77	135
Long-term Changes in Environmental Characteristics Required by Sage-Grouse Predicted under Climate Change	USGS Forest and Range Science Center	Knick et al.	56	4.68	56
GNLCC Multi-dimensional Synthesis of Existing Information	National Park Service	Olliff/Converse	20	4.67	25
Predicting Effects of Climate Change on Aquatic Ecosystems in the Great Northern Landscape: Combining Vulnerability Assessments, Landscape Genomics and Modeling for Conservation	USGS Northern Rocky Mountain Science Center	Muhlfeld et al.	142	4.59	142
The Washington Connected Landscapes Project, Part II: Model Validation	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife	Robb et al	97	4.57	60
Document Fine Scale Linkage Areas and Conservation Delivery of the Northern Rockies in US and Canada	US Fish and Wildlife Service	C. Servheen et al.	317	4.54	195
SageSTEP Long - term Ecological Monitoring Network	Oregon State University	McIvor	150	4.38	75
National Wetlands Inventory for the Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative	US Fish and Wildlife Service	K. Bonn	436	4.33	100
Forecasting the impacts of climate change in the Columbia River Basin: Threats to fish habitat connectivity	USGS Wester Fisheries Research Center	Connelly et al.	145	4.06	130
Species Adaptations to Climate Change: Baseline Data for Grassland, Sagebrush, and Riparian-associated Landbirds in Bird Conservation Region 10	Inter-mountain West Joint Venture	Wightman et al.	30	4.05	35

A Landscape Analysis and Monitoring Program for the Crown of the Continent Ecosystem	Crown Managers Partnership	McDermid et al.	90	3.85	50
Distribution model for Fishers in the northern US Rocky Mountains - Phases 2 and 3	USDA Forest Service RMRS	Schwartz et al	80	NA	80
Wyoming Interagency Spatial Database & Online Management Tools for Wildlife	Wyoming Game and Fish	Nordyke et al	60	3.54	60
Server Support, Data Integration and Processing Dynamical Downscaled Model Projections for GNLCC	USGS	Hostettler et al	22	NA	22
State of Montana Data Integration and Collaborative Services for Crucial Areas Assessments	Montana FWP	Hess Herbert et al	30	3.86	30
Yellowstone Ecological Research Center Workshop and TOPS/EAGLES Pilot for WGA DSSs	University of Montana	Crabtree et al	35	NA	35