

Great Northern Landscape Conservation Cooperative Fiscal Year 2010 Initial Proposals and Draft Criteria

In order to strategically apply available science funding in FY2010, we have initially amassed a number of projects based on ongoing activities supported by existing conservation partnerships across the Great Northern Geographic Area. These proposals address science and information needs that:

- 1) build or expand upon existing efforts, and
- 2) address needs of the preliminary science assessment developed through consultation with conservation practitioners.

Broad areas of emphasis:

- Climate Information (downscaling, models, data mgmt, interfacing)
- Land Cover (NLCD, Landfire, NWI, NASA TOPS other)
- Data Sharing, Mgmt and Interfacing
- Habitat Connectivity (Crucial Area and Corridors, fine-scale linkages etc)
- Ecology and Physiology (species/habitat) information/modeling
- Monitoring and Evaluation – landscape/climate/resources/species/habitat
- Science Communications and Applications

Tentative process that the GNLCC Steering Committee may wish to consider respective to project ranking and ultimate selection:

- Use existing needs identified through landscape plans, programs, workshops and survey information to develop a strategy with general management objectives and subsequent science and information needs
- Identify what level of support is needed (lead, coordinate, support in-kind, fund, etc) and best approach way to implement and accomplish
- Evaluate all projects through comparison of proposals (template) using criteria (draft)

The following factors are provided as potential criteria for proposal evaluation:

1. Relevance to climate change or other landscape drivers

Scoring may vary depending upon the type of “project”.

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

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

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

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?

4. Partner engagement

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

5. Ability to show "success" in FY2010 (success is defined as funds being obligated in FY2010 with a clearly articulated outcome and high confidence in completion and application to conservation delivery goals)