



NORTHEAST REGIONAL CONSERVATION NEEDS GRANT PROGRAM



Northeast Regional Conservation Needs

2007 Grant Cycle

Administrator's Executive Summary

2007 GRANT CYCLE APPROVED PROJECTS

NEAFWA Directors met October 4-6, 2007 at Acadia University in Wolfville, Nova Scotia to discuss and approve Northeast Regional Conservation Needs (RCN) grants. WMI provided facilitation services. Agencies represented included CT, MA, NH, MD, NY, PA Fish and Boat Commission and WV. NEAFWA Directors reviewed summaries of rankings and scores provided by Northeast Wildlife Administrator Association (NEWAA), Northeast Fisheries Administrator Association (NEFAA), Northeast Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee (NEWDTC) and RCN Technical Review Committees.

NEAFWA Directors conditionally approved 8 RCN grants. Included in the list of 8 approved grants were 7 of the 9 full proposals. In addition, NEAFWA Directors approved a motion to dedicate all remaining funds available in the grant cycle following funding of the 7 approved grants into an 8th grant to support NEAFWA implementation of landscape level shrubland habitat initiatives. Conditional approved is predicated upon:

1. Conditional grant awards are subject to NEAFWA member agency state budget approval processes. RCN grant funding may not be available if RCN

projects are not approved at the state level for each of the 15 jurisdictions that are members of NEAFWA.

2. Conditional grant awards are subject to federal State Wildlife Grants Program compliance as administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Once federal compliance is met and state funding is approved, grantees will receive written notification from WMI acknowledging final approval of the grant award. Final approval will be issued no later than February 2008.

RCN GRANT 1: Creation of Regional Habitat Cover Maps: Application of the NE Terrestrial Habitat Classification System

Project Director:

Mark G. Anderson Ph.D., Director of Conservation Science, The Nature Conservancy, Eastern Region, manderson@tnc.org, 11 Avenue de Lafayette, 5th floor, Boston, MA 02111, 617-542-1908 x 215 phone, 617-482-5866 fax

Other Principal Investigators:

Lesley Sneddon MS., Senior Regional Ecologist East, NatureServe

Susan C. Gawler Ph.D., Regional Vegetation Ecologist East, NatureServe

This project will create a comprehensive wildlife habitat map of the eastern region, including all states from Maine to Virginia, west to New York, Pennsylvania and West Virginia. The map will consist of a spatially comprehensive GIS grid of 30 meter pixels with a legend portraying the Northeastern Terrestrial Habitat Classification System (NETHCS). The map will include a series of map legends that range from coarser-scale with higher accuracy (habitats or groups of habitats) to finer-scale with lower accuracy (NVC associations or alliances). This assumes that not every habitat type will be equally amenable to the mapping procedures described here.

RCN GRANT 2: Northeast Regional Connectivity Assessment Project

Project Director:

Terry Cook, Director of Science, Eastern U.S. Conservation Region, The Nature Conservancy, tcook@tnc.org, 490 Westfield Road, Charlottesville, VA 22901, 434) 951-0589 (Phone), (434) 979-0370 (Fax)

Other Principal Investigators:

Mark Anderson, Ph.D., Director of Conservation Science, Eastern US Conservation Region, The Nature Conservancy

Arlene Olivero, Aquatic Ecologist, Eastern U.S. Conservation Region, The Nature Conservancy

Mark P. Smith, Director, Eastern U.S. Freshwater Program, The Nature Conservancy
Sally Yozell, Director, Eastern U.S. Marine Program, The Nature Conservancy

The goal of this project is to support both the Northeast Fish Passage Initiative (NEFPI) and aspects of The Nature Conservancy's Northwest Atlantic Marine ecoregional assessment through the development of a regional database and specific tools and analysis. The NEFPI is being developed by the Northeast states to "reconnect fragmented river, stream, coastal, reservoir, lake, and estuarine habitat by removing or bypassing key barriers to fish passage thereby enhancing populations of fish including: Diadromous, obligate coldwater, Federal/State listed, and species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN)." In the same timeframe, The Nature Conservancy is working with state, federal and other partners to undertake an ecoregional assessment for the Northwest Atlantic Marine (NAM) ecoregion to identify the ecological systems, natural communities, and species that are representative of an ecoregion, establish long-term goals for the abundance, condition and distribution of these systems, communities, and species, and develop a portfolio of conservation areas and strategies that, if conserved or implemented, would achieve the long-term goals.

RCN GRANT 3: Identifying Relationships between Invasive Species and Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the Northeast Region

Project Director:

Glen N. Stevens, Ph.D., Research Scientist, Conservation Management Institute, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, glstevens@vt.edu, 1900 Kraft Dr. Suite 250 MS0534, Blacksburg, VA 24061, 540.231.2671, 540.231.7019

Other Principal Investigators:

Jefferson L. Waldon, Executive Director, Conservation Management Institute, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

The overall goal of the project is to produce a concise set of documents that identifies the most critical potential interactions between invasive species (including terrestrial and aquatic species) and Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the Northeast Region.

RCN GRANT 4: Development of Avian Indicators and Measures for Monitoring Threats and Effectiveness of Conservation Actions in the Northeast

Project Leader:

Dan Lambert, Northeast Bird Monitoring Coordinator, Chair of the Northeast Mountain Bird Working Group, American Bird Conservancy, c/o Vermont Institute of Natural Science, PO Box 1281, Quechee, VT 05059, dlambert@abcbirds.org, Phone: 802-359-5001 ext 232, Fax : 802-359-5001

Other Principal Investigators:

David Adams, Senior Wildlife Biologist, Chair of the Northeast Marsh Bird Working Group, New York State Department of Environmental Conservation

Michael Morgan, Wildlife Ecologist, Chair of the Northeast Grassland Bird Working Group, Audubon New York

Greg Shriver, Assistant Professor of Wildlife Ecology, Salt Marsh Bird Monitoring Project Leader, University of Delaware

Northeastern wildlife and wildlife habitats are at risk from a variety of anthropogenic threats. Monitoring these threats and the effectiveness of conservation actions is the key to optimizing allocation of limited resources. Birds stand out among other wildlife taxa as particularly useful indicators, as they are widespread, observable, and sensitive to environmental change. Techniques for monitoring birds are also relatively advanced, with new field and statistical methods promising to add value to decades of past surveys. We propose to develop regionally coordinated bird monitoring programs that measure both threats and management effects. We will concentrate on marshes, grasslands, and mountain forests - habitats that span the northeastern landscape, contain a high percentage of vulnerable species, and encompass the region's major management issues. Products of this work will include a peer-reviewed survey design, protocol, and regional database for each indicator group. Support for this project will accelerate implementation of "A Framework for Coordinated Bird Monitoring in the

Northeast” and initiate essential components of “The Northeast Monitoring and Performance Reporting Framework”.

RCN GRANT 5: The Conservation Status of Key Habitats and Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the Eastern Region

Project Director:

Mark G. Anderson Ph.D., Director of Conservation Science, The Nature Conservancy, Eastern Region, manderson@tnc.org, 11 Avenue de Lafayette, 5th floor, Boston, MA 02111, 617-542-1908 x 215 phone, 617-482-5866 fax

Other Principal Investigators:

Charles Ferree MS., Landscape Ecologist, The Nature Conservancy, Eastern Region

Arlene Olivero MS., Aquatic Ecologist, The Nature Conservancy, Eastern Region,

We will summarize the regional conservation status of each key habitat and species target by overlaying information on the location and condition of the target with information on conservation land ownership and management. Because the wildlife action plans in most States identified loss of habitat due to degradation, conversion and fragmentation as the primary problem impacting SPCN in their states, the report will serve as a powerful first-step, and a solid platform, for developing the more ambitious product described by the workshop participants. Production of this report will also facilitate collaboration, develop a sense of teamwork and bring into focus the regional context of the individual state wildlife reports.

RCN GRANT 6: An Interactive, GIS-Based Application to Estimate Continuous, Unimpacted Daily Streamflow at Ungaged Locations in the Connecticut River Basin

Project Director:

Stacey A. Archfield, Hydrologist, MA-RI Water Science Center, U.S. Geological Survey, sarch@usgs.gov, USGS MA-RI WSC, 10 Bearfoot Road, Northborough, MA 01532, 508-490-5072, 508-490-5068

Other Principal Investigators:

Elizabeth Ahearn, Hydrologist, CT Water Science Center, U.S. Geological Survey

Peter A. Steeves, Physical Scientist, MA-RI Water Science Center, U.S. Geological Survey

Peter K. Weiskel, Associate Director, MA-RI Water Science Center, U.S. Geological Survey

Keith W. Robinson, Director, NH-VT Water Science Center, U.S. Geological Survey

The objective of this study is to expand underlying multi-variate regression equations and spatial data to provide an interactive point-and-click GIS application to estimate continuous, daily unimpacted streamflow at any ungaged location in the Connecticut River basin. This proposal is intended to address Priority RCN Topic 3: Development of Instream Flow Standards, Guidelines, and Policies through the development of a seamless, multi-state GIS-based point-and-click application that will allow users to identify a stream reach of interest in the Connecticut River basin and obtain estimated continuous daily, unimpacted or “natural” streamflow at the selected location. Streamflow estimates are intended for use to obtain environmental-flow statistics from software such as the Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration (Richter and others, 1996). The application will span the entire Connecticut River basin, including the states of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire and Vermont. The proposed project will integrate current work being completed in cooperation with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection and the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection.

RCN GRANT 7: Proposal to Establish a Regional Initiative for Biomass Energy Development for Early-Succession SGCN in the Northeast

Project Director:

Jefferson L. Waldon, Executive Director, Conservation Management Institute, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, fwixchg@vt.edu, 1900 Kraft Dr. Suite 250 MS0534, Blacksburg, VA 24061, 540/231-4540 voice, 540/231-7019 fax

Other Principal Investigators:

Scott Klopfer, Conservation Management Institute

The goal of this project is to establish a recognizable, proactive, multi-agency group focused on developing a cooperative relationship with the biomass energy industry with the intention to minimize the negative impacts on, and maximize the benefits for, Species of Greatest Conservation Need as described in accepted state wildlife action plans of Northeastern States.

RCN GRANT 8: Implementing Bird Action Plans for Shrubland Dependents in the Northeast

Project Director:

Robert McDowel, Executive Secretary, Northeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, rmcdowellowa@yahoo.com, 116 East Shore Lake Owassa Road, Newton NJ 07860, (973) 948-7643

State Wildlife Action Plans for states in the Northeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies collectively identify greater than 80 Species of Greatest Conservation Need that are dependent upon shrubland habitats. Work under this grant will improve the conservation status of shrubland habitat-dependent Species of Greatest Conservation Need within Bird Conservation Region (BCR) 28 – Appalachian Mountains and BCR 14 – Atlantic Northern Forest by extending the implementation of an existing shrubland restoration and management initiative. Grant funds will be used to create Best Management Practices, develop demonstration areas, increase landowner interest and awareness, and provide technical and financial assistance to private landowners.

Table 1. Conditionally approved RCN grants for 2007.

Brief Title	SwgFunds	NonFedFunds	Total Funds	Rank
8: Reg Hab Maps: NE Terrestrial Hab Class System	\$65806	\$65809	\$131615	1.8
12: Northeast Regional Connectivity Assessment	\$55965	\$68880	\$124845	2.5
10: Invasive Species and SGCN	\$38838	\$38838	\$77676	4.3
11: Avian Indicators and Measures	\$54000	\$56299	\$110299	4.7
9: Conservation Status of Key Habitats and Species	\$53187	\$53187	\$106373	5.3
15: GIS based Application to Estimate Stream Flow	\$48069	\$48069	\$96138	5.7
14: Biomass Energy Initiative	\$36971	\$36971	\$73942	6.3
Shrubland Landscape Habitat Initiatives	\$30736	\$50000	\$80736	
18: Coastal and Marine Monitoring Framework	\$0	\$0	\$0	6.2
2: ForRest: Habitat Decision Tool	\$0	\$0	\$0	8.1

2008 RCN RFP TOPICS

NEAFWA Directors approved re-issuance of the 2007 RCN Topic Areas for the 2008 Grant Cycle Request for Proposals.

2008 GRANT CYCL: AGREED UPON PROCEDURES

NEAFWA Directors approved the following timeline for the 2008 Grant Cycle. The revision to the Grant Cycle builds in additional time for applicants and reviewers and retains the guiding principle that all decision-making by NEAFWA Directors will occur at either the fall or spring face-to-face meetings.

<i>TIMING</i>	<i>RCN GRANT GENERATION</i>	<i>RCN TOPIC GENERATION</i>
Fall 2007 Directors Meeting	Approve 2007 Projects	Approve 2008 RCN Topics (Repeat 2007 RCNs)
January 2008	RFP ISSUED FOR 2008 PROJECTS	
Fall 2007 & Winter 2008		Agency Process: Vet 2009 RCN Topics (as proposed from 2007 NEWDTC)
February 15 2008	Pre-Proposals Due to WMI	
February 22 2008	Pre-Proposals Distributed to TCs	
March 2008		NEWAA/NEFAA RANK 2009 TOPICS
April 4 2008	TC Rankings of Pre-Proposals Due to WMI	
April 11 2008	TC Rankings Distributed to NEWAA/NEFAA	
Spring 2008 Directors Meeting		Approve RCN 2009 Topics
May 16 2008	NEWAA/NEFAA Go/No Go for Full Proposals Due WMI	
May 23 2008	Requests for Full Proposals Distributed by WMI to Applicants	
June 27 2008	Full Proposals Due to WMI	
July 11 2008	Full Proposals Distributed to NEWDTC	
July and August 2008	Agency Process: Vet Full Proposals	Agency Process: Internal Recommendations on 2010 Topics
NEWDTC 2008 Meeting	Rank 2008 Full Proposals	Propose 2010 Topics
Between NEWDTC & Directors	NEWAA/NEFAA Ranking of 2008 Full Proposals	
Fall 2008 Directors Meeting	Approve 2008 Projects	

RCN COORDINATION AGREEMENT

NEAFWA Directors approved the RCN grant program on April 25, 2007 during their regular meeting at the Northeastern Fish and Wildlife Conference, CT. Agencies agreed to commit 4% of annual Federal SWG apportionments. WMI was chosen to provide coordination, administrative and accounting assistance. WMI developed contract language capturing the essence of the Director's action in conjunction with the President and Executive Secretary of NEAFWA. A draft contract was circulated to NEAFWA U.S. Directors and an affirmative vote to approve the contract was obtained June 7, 2007. The NEAFWA/WMI contract was signed June 26, 2007.

2007 PROPOSED AGENCY CONTRIBUTIONS

State	Administrative Fee ¹	Project Funds ²	SWG Funds
CT	\$10500	\$13635	\$24135
DE	\$10500	\$13635	\$24135
DC	\$10500	\$1567	\$12067
ME	\$10500	\$13635	\$24135
MD	\$10500	\$21083	\$31583
MA	\$10500	\$26269	\$36769
NH	\$10500	\$13635	\$24135
NJ	\$10500	\$37427	\$47927
NY	\$10500	\$105640	\$116140
PA Game	\$10500	\$28810	\$39310
PA Fish	\$10500	\$28810	\$39310
RI	\$10500	\$13635	\$24135
VT	\$10500	\$13635	\$24135
VA	\$10500	\$38520	\$49020
WV	\$10500	\$13635	\$24135
TOTAL	\$157500	\$383571	\$541071

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

WMI requested an RCN Executive Committee be formed to provide guidance to the contractor on organizational issues, editing questions, confusions between committee charges, and decisions on which issues, if any, would be elevated to the Director's

attention. President Perry approved the request and appointed committee members to include Steve Weber, NEWAA; Bill Hyatt, NEFAA; and Robert McDowell, NEAFWA.

2007 GRANT CYCLE: AGREED UPON PROCEDURES

Based on discussions with NEWDTC, NEWAA and NEFAA, a timeline was developed to guide the issuance of the RFP and the sequential review and ranking of pre- and full proposals (Appendix 1).

NEWDTC → RCN TOPIC AREAS → NEWAA/NEFAA → DIRECTORS → RFP → PRE-PROPOSALS → TECHNICAL COORDINATORS → NEWAA/NEFAA → FULL PROPOSALS → NEWDTC → NEWAA/NEFAA → DIRECTORS → APPROVED RCN GRANTS

TECHNICAL COORDINATORS

The success of the Northeast RCN grant program relies upon a dedicated corps of Technical Coordinators (TC) willing to volunteer to shepherd viable RCNs through development, committee review and fiscal management. Roles and responsibilities of TC are shown in Appendix 2.

RCN Technical Coordinators for the 2007 Grant Cycle included Jenny Dickson, CT; Glen Therres, MD; George Matula, ME; Curtis Taylor, WV; Emily Brunkhurst, NH; Andrew Milliken, USFWS; Rick Jacobson, CT. They carried out their duties efficiently and effectively.

RFP AND PREPROPOSALS

The RFP for the inaugural NE RCN Grants Program was delivered to 339 email addresses on June 12, 2007. Eighteen pre-proposals were submitted for consideration by the July 1 deadline. Proposal topics covered six of the seven RCNs (the RCN on

identification of conservation focal areas did not receive any proposals). Applicants (primary) included one state agency, three federal agencies, one university and seven NGOs. Geographic coverage included all states in NEAFWA. Proposed projects included five aquatic, eight terrestrial and five combined aquatic/terrestrial focal areas.

Pre-proposals were reviewed by RCN Technical Coordinators and their review teams. Pre-proposals were scored on a common scoring system. Committees scored within RCNs only.

The 18 pre-proposals and a synopsis of TC review team questions and comments were distributed to NEWAA/NEFAA on August 1, 2007. NEWAA/NEFAA members were asked to vote yea/nay on whether to invite a full proposal from the pre-proposal applicant. Members voted via an official ballot returned to WMI. Sixteen voters from 10 states and the USFWS participated (Table 2).

Table 2. Number of NEWAA and NEFAA members who returned pre-proposal ballots to WMI.

	NEFAA	NEWAA	TOTAL
CT	1		1
DC			
DE	1	1	2
FWS	1		1
MA			
MD			
ME	1		1
NH		1	1
NJ	1		1
NY	1	1	2
PA	1	1	2
RI	1	1	2
VA		1	1
VT			
WV		1	1

NEWAA/NEFAA reviewed pre-proposals and used the scores of the TC review team and their own evaluation to inform the recommendation that nine applicants be invited to submit full proposals (Table 3).

SUB-REGIONAL PROJECTS

NEWAA/NEFAA members were also given the opportunity to identify those pre-proposals that they desired to fund from funds other than RCN funds. There were three pre-proposals that one state each identified as projects they would fund if the projects were not selected as RCN grants (4, 6, and 12). Three states indicated that they would possibly consider funding projects 8, 11 and 18. No further discussions have been had with the states indicating interest in funding projects individually.

FULL PROPOSALS

Based upon the July action by NEWAA/NEFAA members, nine Northeast Regional Conservation Needs (RCN) pre-proposals were selected to advance to the full proposal phase. Pre-proposal applicants were advised of requested changes and clarifications offered by Technical Coordinator (TC) review teams and USFWS Federal Aid staff. Applicants resubmitted full proposals to WMI by August 20, 2007. Proposals were summarized and distributed to the members of the Northeast Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee (NEWDTC) for their review.

WMI facilitated a half-day session at the NEWDTC annual meeting to allow members to discuss and eventually prioritize RCN proposals. The Committee met at the National Conservation Training Center in Shepherdstown, West Virginia on September 5, 2007. All U.S. jurisdictions within the membership of the Northeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies were represented at the NEWDTC meeting with the exception of the District of Columbia. Also present were representatives from the USFWS Federal Aid Division and the Atlantic Coast Joint Venture. NEWDTC attendees included:

- ME – George Matula
- VT – Jon Kart
- NH – John Kanter
- NY – John Ozard
- MA – John O’Leary (not present, proxy assigned),

- CT – Julie Victoria
- RI – Christopher Raithel
- PA GC – Dan Brauning
- PA FBC – Dave Day
- NJ – Kris Schantz
- DE – Karen Bennett
- MD – Glenn Therres
- VA – Rick Reynolds
- WV – Craig Stihler

All in attendance participated in discussions. Only NEWDTC members voted on recommendations with one vote allowed per state except PA which was accorded two votes as per NEWDTC bylaws. MA was represented by proxy. Facilitation services were provided by D.J. Case & Associates. In order to expedite information and allow full participation, TurningPoint® software and remote voting devices were used to record the votes of NEWDTC members.

First, NEWDTC members were asked to vote either “Yes” or “No” on whether the individual proposals should be recommended for award in 2007. The metric reported herein is the percentage of states voting “Yes”

NEWDTC members then prioritized the nine proposals. Meeting participants were given the opportunity to vote three times for their preference. They were allowed to vote for either three different proposals at once or they could vote three times for their most preferred proposal. The metric reported herein is the number of priority points received by proposal.

A summary of the NEWDTC rankings and the nine full proposals were distributed to NEWAA/NEFAA members September 13, 2007. NEWAA/NEFAA members were instructed to rank the nine proposals from 1 (highest) to 9 (lowest). Members voted via an official ballot returned to WMI. NEWAA and NEFAA discussed the proposals via

separate conference calls on September 27, 2007. Twenty-three voters from 12 jurisdictions and the USFWS submitted ballots to WMI (Table 4).

Table 3: Pre-proposals accepted and rejected by NEWAA/NEFAA members for advancement to the full proposal phase of the 2007 RCN grant program.

ACTION	TITLE	NO	YES	TOTAL	% YES	RANK
Full Proposal Requested	Prop 12 Northeast Regional Connectivity Assessment Project	1	15	16	94%	1
	Prop 8 Regional Habitat Maps: NE Terrestrial Habitat Classification System	1	15	16	94%	1
	Prop 10 Identifying Relationships between Invasive Species and SGCN	3	13	16	81%	3
	Prop 9 Conservation Status of Key Habitats and Species	3	13	16	81%	3
	Prop 11 Development of avian indicators and measures	4	12	16	75%	5
	Prop 14 Regional Initiative on Biomass Energy Dev for ESH SGCN in the NE	5	11	16	69%	6
	Prop 15 GIS based Application to Estimate Stream Flow	5	11	16	69%	6
	Prop 18 Monitoring Framework for Coastal and Marine Resources	9	7	16	44%	8
	Prop 2 ForRest: Habitat Decision Tool	11	5	16	31%	9
Rejected	Prop 3 Dev and Field Test of Rapid Assessment of SS Habitats	12	4	16	25%	10
	Prop 4 Dev Brook Trout Profile Model for Stream Habitat Assess	12	4	16	25%	10
	Prop 7 Rebuilding End Coastal Sandplain Grasslands and Shrublands	12	4	16	25%	10
	Prop 16 Overcoming Barriers to SWAP through local Planning Birds	14	2	16	13%	13
	Prop 5 Feasibility of Remote Sensing for Alien Plan Invasions	14	2	16	13%	13
	Prop 6 Mahoosics Conservation	14	2	16	13%	13
	Prop 17 CT River Alliance Feasibility Study	15	1	16	6%	16
	Prop 1 Id and Protection of MA Coldwater Resources	16		16	0%	17
	Prop 13 MD Important Bird Area Mapping Program	16		16	0%	17

Table 4. Number of NEWAA and NEFAA members who returned full proposal ballots.

	NEFAA	NEWAA	Grand Total
CT	2	1	3
DC	1	1	2
DE	0	1	1
MA	0	0	0
MD	1	1	2
ME	2	0	2
NH	1	1	2
NJ	1	0	1
NY	1	1	2
PA	0	1	1
RI	1	1	2
VA	0	0	0
VT	1	1	2
WV	1	1	2
FWS	1	0	1
TOTAL	13	10	23

In the Administrator’s Notes section that follows, all rankings/scorings are reported for each proposal (Table 5). Included in the list of evaluation metrics is:

1. NEFAA Rank.
2. NEWAA Rank
3. AVERAGE OF NEFAA/NEWAA Rank.
4. RANKED NEWDTC %Yes Votes (% of NEWDTC members voting to move proposal forward to Directors for funding consideration)
5. RANKED NEWDTC Priority Points (number of points assigned to proposals by NEWDTC members)
6. RANKED ADMIN %Yes (% of NEWAA/NEFAA members voting to move pre-proposal forward to full proposal request)
7. RANKED TC Score (Average score from 8 standardized questions answered by the TC and TC Review Teams)

Table 5: RCN Proposals numbered in the order received.

NE 2007 RCN GRANT PROGRAM		RANKINGS						
		ADMIN FULL-PROPOSAL			NEWDTC		ADMIN	TC
		NEFAA	NEWAA	AVG.	%YES	PRIORITY	PRE-PROP	SCORE
PTS.								
N	Brief Title							
2	ForRest: Habitat Decision Tool	7.8	8.6	8.1	9	8	9	9
8	Regional Habitat Maps: NE Terrestrial Habitat Class Sys	2.4	1.1	1.8	1	1	1	2
9	Conservation Status of Key Habitats and Species	4.8	5.8	5.3	7	8	3	4
10	Identifying Relationships between Invasive Species and SGCN	4.2	4.5	4.3	2	5	3	7
11	Development of avian indicators and measures	5.5	3.7	4.7	6	3	5	6
12	Northeast Regional Connectivity Assessment Project	1.7	3.6	2.5	3	6	1	1
14	Regional Biomass Energy Initiative for ESH SGCN in the NE	7.2	5.2	6.3	5	4	6	3
15	GIS based Application to Estimate Stream Flow	4.7	7.0	5.7	7	6	6	5
18	Monitoring Framework for Coastal and Marine Resources	6.7	5.5	6.2	3	2	8	8
All Projects Total								

¹ Regional Conservation Need Proposal Number

² Rankings by Administrators of Full Proposals

³ Rankings by Northeast Wildlife Diversity Committee of Full Proposals. % Yes is the number of committee members voting to advance proposal for consideration by Directors. Priority points is the number of points assigned as an index of importance of the project to the agency.

⁴ Rankings by Administrators of Pre-Proposals

⁵ Rankings by Technical Coordinators of Pre-Proposals

RCN 1: Creation of Regional Habitat Cover Maps

Background

Previous work under this RCN has created an inventory of existing GIS capabilities for both aquatic and terrestrial classification systems and datasets; a common classification system for both terrestrial and aquatic systems that can be cross-walked to existing state classification schemes, and a regional dataset of existing protected lands including federal, state, local and conservation group fee simple purchased and permanent easement protected lands.

Desired Products

Potential products from the current RFP will include maps and data products in a format compatible with each state's GIS standards, with complete metadata.

Technical Coordinator

Andrew Milliken, Atlantic Coast Joint Venture Coordinator

Review Committee

Andrew Milliken, USFWS; Lynn Davidson, MD DNR; John O'Leary, MA F&W; Dave Morton VA DGIF; Dan Brauning PA GC; and Becky Gwynn VA DGIF.

Response to RFP

Four pre-proposals were submitted and reviewed. Two full proposals were requested (Proposal Numbers 2 and 8). Each is detailed below with a table of reviewer scores and a compilation of any review committee comments.

PROPOSAL 2: ForRest: A Habitat Decision Tool for Restoring the Ecological Value of Working Forests

NEWDTIC COMMENTS ON FULL PROPOSAL

- Potential to guide management decisions.
- Unclear how this proposal relates to the RCN Topic.
- Only benefits 5 states.

TECHNICAL COORDINATOR REVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS ON PRE-PROPOSAL

RCN: 1								
Proposal 2: 1 of 4 within RCN								
Proposal Principle Author: Jenkins								
Proposal Title: ForRest: A Habitat Decision Tool for Restoring the Ecological Value of Working Forests								
Ranking Criteria	Reviewers							AVG
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
1. What is the geographic scope ?	2	2	5	3	4	5	5	3.7
2. Is sound science used; will these methods accomplish/produce the proposed project objectives/goals?	5	2	4	4	4	4	4	3.9
3. Will/can the proposed objectives and methodology produce the desired outcomes?	3	2	5	1	4	3	2	2.9
4. Are objectives clearly defined, achievable, measurable, and connected to specific goals and timelines?	4	2	5	4	4	5	4	4.0
5. Are the proposed project costs reasonable and is the project's cost-benefit ratio reasonable?	4	3	4	5	4	3	4	3.9
6. Does the proposed project address the desired products described in the RCN ?	3	2	5	1	4	4	1	2.9
7. What is the anticipated, extended use/life of the project's results/products/services?	5	2	4	2	4	4	5	3.7
8. What is the technical/social/legal feasibility of the project?	3	3	4	3	3	5	3	3.4
TOTAL SCORE	29	18	36	23	31	33	28	28.3

Technical Coordinator Review Committee Comments on Pre-proposal:

Comment 1: Five of the six committee members ranked this project second, one ranked it third. The project does not fully address the key next step of the RCN by creating comprehensive regional cover maps but would address regional mapping approaches for managing forested habitats that would initially benefit 5 states and could be applicable to forested areas in all northeast states. The committee thought the application was well written for a complex project including a clear timeline. The committee requests that the applicants provide a stronger link to State Wildlife Action Plans and state agencies and discuss how the list of species ties into species of greatest conservation need. The committee requests that the

applicants discuss how the project would tie into the regional habitat classification that is being developed by NEAFWA.

Comment 2: Benefits to 5 states, sound scientific approach, desired outcomes for forest habitats, project goals clear, cost reasonable but includes overhead, desired products for RCN for forests, long term benefits, and partially tested techniques

PROPOSAL 8: Creation of Regional Habitat Cover Maps: Application of the Northeast Terrestrial Habitat Classification System

NEWDTC COMMENTS ON FULL PROPOSAL

- Current habitat classification project is not producing a regional map of habitats; this project is the next logical step.
- Habitat maps intended to guide planning at the regional level.
- States can use maps to identify habitat priorities within a regional context (i.e., how important are my state's habitats to the region).
- Commitment to long-term maintenance is needed to ensure habitat map is not static, but rather updated regularly as new information is gathered.
- Not intended to replace state-level habitat mapping.
- Low resolution and projection system selected can make utility at the state level difficult for smaller states.

TECHNICAL COORDINATOR REVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS ON PRE-PROPOSAL

RCN: 1 Proposal 8: 3 of 4 within RCN Proposal Principle Author: Anderson Proposal Title: Creation of Regional Habitat Cover Maps: Application of the Northeast Terrestrial Habitat Classification System								
Ranking Criteria	Reviewers							AVG
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
1. What is the geographic scope ?	10	4	10	10	9	10	10	9.0
2. Is sound science used; will these methods accomplish/produce the proposed project objectives/goals?	4	3	4	5	5	4	4	4.1
3. Will/can the proposed objectives and methodology produce the desired outcomes?	5	3	5	5	5	4	5	4.6
4. Are objectives clearly defined, achievable, measurable, and connected to specific goals and timelines?	4	4	5	3	5	4	5	4.3
5. Are the proposed project costs reasonable and is the project's cost-benefit ratio reasonable?	4	4	4	4	5	5	5	4.4
6. Does the proposed project address the desired products described in the RCN ?	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	4.6
7. What is the anticipated, extended use/life of the project's results/products/services?	4	4	4	3	5	5	4	4.1
8. What is the technical/social/legal feasibility of the project?	4	3	4	3	4	5	5	4.0
TOTAL SCORE	40	29	41	38	43	41	42	39.1

Technical Coordinator Review Committee Comments on Pre-proposal:

Comment 1: The committee unanimously agreed that this was the top ranked project. It was the only project that completely and directly addressed the RCN by completing the next phase of this project, the terrestrial habitat mapping based on the Northeastern Terrestrial Habitat Classification System. The Project Director and Principal Investigators are involved in the

NFWF/Doris Duke project that is completing the initial habitat classification and mapping work under this RCN. The project will also fit in with existing or planned projects including Regional Gap Analysis and LandFire. The committee requested that the applicants provide additional information on the map products that would be provided including an illustrative example or two and address the issue of how the habitat maps would be regional in scale without being too homogenous to be useful. The committee requests clarification of the source of and commitment by states for the NEAFWA and Heritage match. The Committee requests that the applicants provide additional detail on how they would ensure ongoing coordination with states (steering committee etc...). Finally, the committee requests that the applicants explicitly state that they will make products available to each state in the region.

Comment 2: Project ties directly to NFWF project and is logical next step; benefits all states in region; will produce desired outcomes in RCN; project objectives clearly defined although illustrative examples of mapping using ELUs would be helpful; costs seem reasonable for the products produced; project clearly addresses need in RCN; benefits should be reasonably long-term; techniques feasible but need more description

Comment 3: Move forward for funding consideration; needs to clarify match and match agreements

RCN 2: Identify Invasive Species that Impact Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the Northeast

Desired Products

- a) A list of the top 20 invasive species of each state.
- b) A list of invasive species common to all states of the region.
- c) A report that summarizes the suite of invasive species most likely to impact Species of Greatest Conservation Need with a description of the means and severity of that impact.

Technical Coordinator

Curtis Taylor, WVDNR

Review Committee

Curtis Taylor, WVDNR; William Hyatt, CT DEP; Scot Williamson, WMI

Response to RFP

Two pre-proposals were submitted and reviewed. One full proposal was requested (Proposal Number 10) which is detailed below with a table of reviewer scores and a compilation of any review committee comments.

PROPOSAL 10: Identifying relationships between invasive species and Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the Northeast region.

NEWDTC COMMENTS ON FULL PROPOSAL

- Project aligns well with the RCN Topic.
- Unclear how project would lead to regional action, but this was not specifically requested in the RFP.

TECHNICAL COORDINATOR REVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS ON PRE-PROPOSAL

RCN 2				
Proposal 10: second of 2 within RCN				
Proposal Principle Author: Stevens				
Proposal Title: Identifying relationships between invasive species and Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the Northeast region.				
Ranking Criteria	Reviewers			AVG
	A	B	C	
1. What is the geographic scope ?	NA	10	10	10.0
2. Is sound science used; will these methods accomplish/produce the proposed project objectives/goals?	NA	3	3	3.0
3. Will/can the proposed objectives and methodology produce the desired outcomes?	NA	2	4	3.0
4. Are objectives clearly defined, achievable, measurable, and connected to specific goals and timelines?	NA	3	4	3.5
5. Are the proposed project costs reasonable and is the project's cost-benefit ratio reasonable?	NA	3	4	3.5
6. Does the proposed project address the desired products described in the RCN ?	NA	4	4	4.0
7. What is the anticipated, extended use/life of the project's results/products/services?	NA	4	3	3.5
8. What is the technical/social/legal feasibility of the project?	NA	3	3	3.0
TOTAL SCORE	0	32	35	33.5

Technical Coordinator Review Committee Comments on Pre-proposal:

Comment 1: My recommendation is to carry [Proposal 10] forward and drop [Proposal 5] from further consideration.

Comment 2: This proposal is excellent in concept. Products #3 and #4 (impacts of current and potential invasive species on GCN species) would be very useful to local and regional conservation efforts by agencies and NGOs. They would also be useful for securing funding and for prioritizing invasive species control/management efforts. However, it will be difficult to successfully develop these products due to inconsistencies among states in determining/listing GCN species. The “top invasive species” will be those “that stand to influence the largest number of GCN species within each state”. This approach is problematic because the regional

picture that develops will be clouded by individual state actions in determining GCNs. The proposal does not provide, or even hint at, a mechanism for dealing with this concern. To be successful, this project will need to develop a rational approach for modifying the GCN species lists of individual states for the purposes of a regional assessment. I expect that this would increase the cost and time required.

An example: Only a few states had the foresight to include marine (saltwater) fauna on their GCN lists. Hence, a saltwater invasive might only figure into this approach in a few states whereas, in reality, the species might have similar impacts throughout the region. The net result will be to diminish the regional importance of such invasives unless the approach is modified. Additional concern/opportunity: It is not apparent whether or not this proposal is intended to include aquatic invasive species. I would argue that aquatic species need to be included for the simple reason that invasives such as hydrilla, milfoil, zebra mussels, fanwort, and viral hemorrhagic septicemia (VHS) exhibit some of the most devastating ecosystem level impacts and incur some of the highest socioeconomic costs of any non-native species in the Northeast Region. Furthermore, many states have federally approved Aquatic Nuisance Species plans that could be combined with GCN species info to produce a useful regional product. ** Could leverage/partner with Northeast and Mid-Atlantic Aquatic Nuisance Species Panels to bring in additional state, regional and federal partners.

RCN 3: Development of Instream Flow Standards, Guidelines and Policies

Desired Products

- a) A compendium (on CD or other electronic means) of synchronized data layers for the calculation of synthetic “natural” hydrographs for streams throughout the northeast region.
- b) Algorithms with a graphic user interface for integration into ESRI ArcView (or other ESRI geospatial data management software) for the calculation of site specific synthetic “natural” hydrographs.

Technical Coordinator

Rick Jacobson, CT DEP_

Review Committee

Rick Jacobson, CT DEP; Dave Day, PA FBC, Bill Hyatt, CT DEP, Rod Wentworth, VT F&W, Veronica Masson, RI DEM; Leroy Young, PA FBC, Todd Richards, MA DFW, John Magee, NH F&G

Response to RFP

One pre-proposal was submitted and reviewed and subsequently accepted to the full proposal phase (Proposal Number 15). Reviewer scores and a compilation of any review committee comments are detailed below.

PROPOSAL 15: An Interactive, GIS-Based Application to Estimate Continuous, Unimpacted Daily Streamflow at Ungaged Locations in the CT River Basin

NEWDTC COMMENTS ON FULL PROPOSAL

- Though this project appears limited in geographic scope, the technical review team determined that project methods can be transferred to other watersheds throughout the region.
- Proposal states this product already exists, proposal is to refine existing models.
- Unclear on value of project to SGCN.
- Project aligns well with the RCN.

TECHNICAL COORDINATOR REVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS ON PRE-PROPOSAL

RCN: 3						
Proposal 15: 1 of 1 within RCN						
Proposal Principle Author: Archfield						
Proposal Title: An interactive, GIS-based application to estimate continuous, unimpacted daily streamflow at ungaged locations in the CT River Basin						
Ranking Criteria	Reviewers					AVG
	A	B	C	D	E	
1. What is the geographic scope ?	1	4	1	4	7	3.4
2. Is sound science used; will these methods accomplish/produce the proposed project objectives/goals?	5	5	5	5	5	5.0
3. Will/can the proposed objectives and methodology produce the desired outcomes?	5	5	3	3	4	4.0
4. Are objectives clearly defined, achievable, measurable, and connected to specific goals and timelines?	5	4	4	5	5	4.6
5. Are the proposed project costs reasonable and is the project's cost-benefit ratio reasonable?	5	5	4	4	3	4.2
6. Does the proposed project address the desired products described in the RCN ?	5	5	4	5	4	4.6
7. What is the anticipated, extended use/life of the project's results/products/services?	5	5	4	5	4	4.6
8. What is the technical/social/legal feasibility of the project?	5	3	4	5	5	4.4
TOTAL SCORE	36	36	29	36	37	34.8

Technical Coordinator Review Committee Comments on Pre-proposal:

As the lead member of the team that framed RNC 3 – “Development of Instream Flow Standards, Guidelines and Policies” during the March 2006 meeting on regional conservation needs in Albany, New York, I can confirm that the products intended from the proposal are what were envisioned by the work group. It was readily recognized that this would represent one part of a larger suite of tools that collectively would serve as a foundation for constructing instream flow standards, guidelines and policies. Having a tool that would provide scientifically sound reference (AKA natural) flow time series (e.g., hydrographs) at ungaged sites is critical to the larger objective of instream standards based on natural conditions.

From the reviewer comments there appear to be two primary questions to be addressed in a full proposal. First, the authors should better describe the degree to which the products from this project are transferable to other areas of the region. It is clear that the reviewers had to make certain assumptions about transferability and that the assumptions are reflected in wide ranging scores. If in fact the products are transferable, either as a component/complement to the StreamStats system being implemented nationally, or as a stand alone tool, the overall score would increase substantially.

Second, greater detail should be incorporated into the budget, both in terms of services performed for the funds provided as well as in terms of match provided. Perhaps a clearer accounting of the technical skills and hours applied to the project would resolve some of the concerns over cost.

Overall, the project is very sound and the team proposing to do the work has a long and established track record for producing high quality products. Of greater benefit still is the availability of these products in the public domain so that they will be readily usable by both the regulatory and regulated communities. The commitment of the project team to producing a technical document describing the tool, published by the US government only enhances its attractiveness.

**RCN 4: Development of Model Guidelines for Assisting Local
Planning Boards with Conservation of Species of Greatest
Conservation Need and their Key Habitats through Local Land Use
Planning**

Desired Products

- a) A compilation of existing information for each state in the Northeast Region on provision of technical assistance to land-use planners, including descriptions of:
 - i) type, extent and delivery mechanism of existing resources provided by the states to land-use planners (map-based information, written text, etc);
 - ii) current legal framework in each state to address the conservation of Species of Greatest Conservation Need;
 - iii) existing *Best Management Practices* (BMPs) guidelines for Species of Greatest Conservation Need
- b) A report that identifies
 - i) the network of state or regional programs that may affect or influence land-use decision making;
 - ii) related funding sources to aid multi-jurisdictional wildlife conservation or resource planning efforts;
 - iii) the most innovative and effective aspects of regional programs;
 - iv) steps needed to create a “Tool Kit for Local Land-use Planners to Address Conservation of Species of Greatest Conservation Need”

Technical Coordinator

Emily Brunkhurst, NH Fish and Game

Review Committee

Emily Brunkhurst, NHFG; Jens Hilke, VTFW; Maura Adams, The Jordan Institute; Carolyn Russell, NHDES

Response to RFP

One pre-proposal was submitted and reviewed but was not accepted to the full proposal phase.

RCN 5: Identification of Regional Focal Areas and Corridors for the Conservation of Species of Great Conservation Need in the Northeast

Desired Products

- a) A set of criteria used to determine focus areas.
- b) A map of focus areas in the Northeast Region.
- c) A table summarizing features and recommendations for each focus area.
- d) A GIS database available online with above information at regional and state scale.

Technical Coordinator

Glenn Therres, MD Department of Natural Resources

Response to RFP

No pre-proposals were submitted

RCN 6: Development of Regional Indicators and Measures

Background

Previous work under this RCN has produced a summary of indicators and measures for Species of Greatest Conservation Need and their habitats, a summary of indicators and measures for monitoring threats and the effectiveness of conservation actions standards for data collection and management and methods to efficiently aggregate and analyze data from states.

Desired Products

- a) A summary of monitoring protocols thought to be most useful.
- b) Development of new monitoring protocols for those species or species groups or indicators where needed.
- c) Coordination services to implement the Northeast Monitoring & Performance Reporting Framework by a program of work that provides ongoing coordination, promotion, problem-solving and communication between and among states and program partners.

Technical Coordinator

George Matula, ME DIFW

Review Committee

George Matula, ME DIFW; Jon Kart, VT F&W; Dan Rosenblatt; Ron Essig, USFWS; Dan Brauning, PGC; Steve Fuller, NH F&G

Response to RFP

Six pre-proposals were submitted and reviewed and three were accepted into the full proposal phase (Proposal Numbers 9, 11, and 18). Each is detailed below with a table of reviewer scores and a compilation of any reviewer comments.

PROPOSAL 9: The Conservation Status of Key Habitats and Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the Eastern Region

NEWDTC COMMENTS ON FULL PROPOSAL

- Project seems premature before habitat mapping is complete.
- This is the next logical step in the terrestrial and freshwater indicators and measures project
- There are already teams working on targets and indicators identified in the Monitoring Framework workshop and it is unclear how this project would differ from or supplement this effort.

TECHNICAL COORDINATOR REVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS ON PRE-PROPOSAL

RCN: 6							
Proposal 9: fifth of 6 within RCN							
Proposal Principle Author: Anderson							
Proposal Title: The Conservation Status of Key Habitats and Species of Greatest Conservation Need in the Eastern Region							
Ranking Criteria	Reviewers						AVG
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
1. What is the geographic scope ?	9	5	10	9	10	10	8.8
2. Is sound science used; will these methods accomplish/produce the proposed project objectives/goals?	3	3	4	3	4	3	3.3
3. Will/can the proposed objectives and methodology produce the desired outcomes?	4	3	5	4	4	4	4.0
4. Are objectives clearly defined, achievable, measurable, and connected to specific goals and timelines?	3	4	4	3	4	3	3.5
5. Are the proposed project costs reasonable and is the project's cost-benefit ratio reasonable?	3	4	3	4	3	5	3.7
6. Does the proposed project address the desired products described in the RCN ?	4	5	4	4	5	5	4.5
7. What is the anticipated, extended use/life of the project's results/products/services?	4	3	4	4	4	4	3.8
8. What is the technical/social/legal feasibility of the project?	2	5	3	5	5		4.0
TOTAL SCORE	32	32	37	36	39	34	35.0

Technical Coordinator Review Committee Comments on Pre-proposal:

Comment 1: This proposal will result in helpful mapping products, but I don't see how it will get us closer to ongoing regional monitoring. However, it will contribute substantially to the performance reporting aspects of the regional effort.

Comment 2: Helps establish mechanism for evaluating NE indicators

PROPOSAL 11: Development of Avian Indicators and Measures for Monitoring Threats and Effectiveness of Conservation Actions in the Northeast

NEWDTIC COMMENTS ON FULL PROPOSAL

- Pilot project that includes only 8 states, but would allow refinement of methods before expanding to the whole region.
- Proposal may be premature because Monitoring Framework is currently under development.
- Species groups in this proposal address targets established at Albany Monitoring Framework workshop.
- Products can be readily communicated to demonstrate results.

TECHNICAL COORDINATOR REVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS ON PRE-PROPOSAL

<p style="text-align: center;">RCN: 6</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposal 11: fourth of 6 within RCN</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposal Principle Author: Lambert</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Proposal Title: Development of Avian Indicators and Measures for Monitoring Threats and Effectiveness of Conservation Actions in the Northeast</p>							
Ranking Criteria	Reviewers						AVG
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
1. What is the geographic scope ?	8	5	10	10	7	7	7.8
2. Is sound science used; will these methods accomplish/produce the proposed project objectives/goals?	4	4	4	4	3	4	3.8
3. Will/can the proposed objectives and methodology produce the desired outcomes?	4	3	5	4	3	2	3.5
4. Are objectives clearly defined, achievable, measurable, and connected to specific goals and timelines?	4	5	5	5	3	4	4.3
5. Are the proposed project costs reasonable and is the project's cost-benefit ratio reasonable?	3	3	4	5	3	4	3.7
6. Does the proposed project address the desired products described in the RCN ?	5	4	5	4	3	3	4.0
7. What is the anticipated, extended use/life of the project's results/products/services?	5	4	5	5	3	4	4.3
8. What is the technical/social/legal feasibility of the project?	3	3	3	5	3		3.4
TOTAL SCORE	36	31	41	42	28	28	34.3

Technical Coordinator Review Committee Comments on Pre-proposal:

Comment 1: This is an excellent proposal that is right on target for meeting regional monitoring needs.

Comment 2: If gain concurrence on methods and cooperation from enough surveyors, the products could be excellent. No guarantee on either point though.

PROPOSAL 18: Development of a Regional Monitoring Framework for Coastal and Marine Resources

NEWDTC COMMENTS ON FULL PROPOSAL

- Current Monitoring Framework project excluded coastal and marine, yet there is a gap in information on coastal and marine resources.
- ACJV sees potential in applying this to coastal species and habitats.
- Use of targets/indicators for coastal and marine areas makes sense due to limited information available compared to terrestrial/freshwater habitat.

TECHNICAL COORDINATOR REVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS ON PRE-PROPOSAL

<p style="text-align: center;">RCN: 6 Proposal 18 : sixth of 6 within RCN Proposal Principle Author: Bennett Proposal Title: Development of a Regional Monitoring Framework for Coastal and Marine Resources</p>							
Ranking Criteria	Reviewers						AVG
	A	B	C	D	E	F	
1. What is the geographic scope ?	8	5	7	7	10	6	7.2
2. Is sound science used; will these methods accomplish/produce the proposed project objectives/goals?	4	3	2	4	3	3	3.2
3. Will/can the proposed objectives and methodology produce the desired outcomes?	4	3	3	3	5	2	3.3
4. Are objectives clearly defined, achievable, measurable, and connected to specific goals and timelines?	3	4	3	3	5	4	3.7
5. Are the proposed project costs reasonable and is the project's cost-benefit ratio reasonable?	4	4	2	3	4	4	3.5
6. Does the proposed project address the desired products described in the RCN ?	4	5	4	3	5	3	4.0
7. What is the anticipated, extended use/life of the project's results/products/services?	4	4	5	4	5	4	4.3
8. What is the technical/social/legal feasibility of the project?	3	5	3	5	5		4.2
TOTAL SCORE	34	33	29	32	42	26	32.7

Technical Coordinator Review Committee Comments on Pre-proposal:

Comment 1: This proposal would be Phase II of the current regional monitoring effort for terrestrial and freshwater aquatic systems. As with Phase I, the products and processes to get there are a bit costly and nebulous.

Comment 2: Develops groundwork for establishment of coastal zone indicators throughout the region.

RCN 7: Development of Habitat Conservation Initiatives at a Landscape Scale

Desired Products

The development and implementation of multi-partner conservation initiatives that focus on the conservation, management and/or protection of focal habitats of Species of Greatest Conservation Need best addressed on a landscape or regional level.

Technical Coordinator

Jenny Dickson, CT DEP

Review Committee

Jenny Dickson, CT DEP Wildlife; Steven Fuller , NH Fish & Game Department; Stephen G. Perry, NH Fish & Game Department
Gary M. Foster, WV DNR

Response to RFP

Four pre-proposals were submitted and reviewed and two were accepted into the full proposal phase (Proposal Numbers 12 and 14). Each is detailed below with a table of reviewer scores and a compilation of any review committee comments. In addition, WMI Early Successional and Grassland Habitat Initiatives were approved by NEAFWA previously.

PROPOSAL 12: Northeast Regional Connectivity Assessment Project

NEWDTC COMMENTS ON FULL PROPOSAL

- May benefit mussels and herps as well as fish.
- Unclear which SGCN would benefit.
- This is a needed compilation of data that already exists in the states.

TECHNICAL COORDINATOR REVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS ON PRE-PROPOSAL

RCN: 7 Proposal 12: second of 4 within RCN Proposal Principle Author: Cook Proposal Title: Northeast Regional Connectivity Assessment Project					
Ranking Criteria	Reviewers				AVG
	A	B	C	D	
1. What is the geographic scope ?	10	10	10	10	10.0
2. Is sound science used; will these methods accomplish/produce the proposed project objectives/ goals?	3	5	5	5	4.5
3. Will/can the proposed objectives and methodology produce the desired outcomes?	5	5	4	5	4.8
4. Are objectives clearly defined, achievable, measurable, and connected to specific goals and timelines?	5	5	4	5	4.8
5. Are the proposed project costs reasonable and is the project's cost-benefit ratio reasonable?	5	5	5	5	5.0
6. Does the proposed project address the desired products described in the RCN ?	4	5	5	5	4.8
7. What is the anticipated, extended use/life of the project's results/products/services?	4	5	4	5	4.5
8. What is the technical/social/legal feasibility of the project?	5	5	5	5	5.0
TOTAL SCORE	41	45	42	45	43.3

Technical Coordinator Review Committee Comments on Pre-proposal:

The total RCN request needs to be better spelled out. A summary line of the total RCN request and the total match provided would be helpful. Under Task 3 reference is made to federal/state listed species and “potentially other priority species.” Are these other species SGCN or is that what they are considering “listed” species? Listed species and SGCN are not interchangeable definitions. This needs clarification. The extended use/life of the project results needs to be clarified.

PROPOSAL 14: Establishing a Regional Initiative for Biomass Energy Development for Early-Succession SGCN in the Northeast

NEWDTC COMMENTS ON FULL PROPOSAL

- This is an emerging issue and the region should be proactive about addressing it now.
- May be more appropriate for another regional or national funding source
- Concern about assigning already limited state agency staff to this project’s working groups.

TECHNICAL COORDINATOR REVIEW SCORES AND COMMENTS ON PRE-PROPOSAL

RCN: 7 Proposal 14: third of 4 within RCN Proposal Principle Author: Waldon Proposal Title: Establishing a Regional Initiative for Biomass Energy Development For Early-Succession SGCN in the Northeast					
Ranking Criteria	Reviewers				AVG
	A	B	C	D	
1. What is the geographic scope ?	7	10	9	10	9.0
2. Is sound science used; will these methods accomplish/produce the proposed project objectives/ goals?	3	5	3	5	4.0
3. Will/can the proposed objectives and methodology produce the desired outcomes?	3	5	4	5	4.3
4. Are objectives clearly defined, achievable, measurable, and connected to specific goals and timelines?	3	5	4	5	4.3
5. Are the proposed project costs reasonable and is the project’s cost-benefit ratio reasonable?	4	5	4	5	4.5
6. Does the proposed project address the desired products described in the RCN ?	4	5	4	5	4.5
7. What is the anticipated, extended use/life of the project’s results/products/services?	4	0	4	5	3.3
8. What is the technical/social/legal feasibility of the project?	3	3	3	3	3.0
TOTAL SCORE	31	38	35	43	36.8

Technical Coordinator Review Committee Comments on Pre-proposal:

Interim targets should be added to the objectives, measures, timeline and products section. The discussion of extended use/life of project results could be expanded to include distribution of details to other user groups: other universities; local land managers; corporations; and state and federal agencies. All will benefit from the some aspect of the study (BMPs, identification of data gaps, contacts/network of resources, etc.).

APPENDIX 1: Timeline and agreed-upon-procedures for the 2007 grant cycle.

Winter 06/07

- Distribute contract to Directors
- NEWDTC assembles RFP distribution list
- Technical coordinators are identified and briefed on responsibilities
- Federal Aid Project 1 grants (Administration) are established at each state in coordination with R5 Federal Aid

April 07 at Northeastern Conference

- State Directors Approve Final Agreement
- State Directors, NEWAA, NEFAA and NEWDTC review and approve RFP
- States obligate administration funds and activate Project 1 Federal Aid grants

May 2007

- WMI invoices states for administration funds as per Project 1. A total of \$135,000 will be invoiced annually to participating states based on their share of all SWG funds allocated that year to all participating states.

May 15, 2007

- RFP is announced requesting pre-proposals
- WMI and Technical Coordinators available to answer questions from applicants

July 1, 2007

- Pre-proposals are due to WMI

July 1 – August 15

- Tech Coordinators assemble review team
- WMI receives pre-proposals, reviews pre-proposals for minimum qualifications, aggregates pre-proposals by RCN and distributes pre-proposals that meet minimum qualifications to Technical Coordinators for review, editing and ranking.
- Ranked pre-proposals are returned from Technical Coordinators to WMI. Ranking will be from highest to lowest score within each respective RCN.
- WMI circulates up to 2 highest ranking pre-proposals for each RCN (one <\$50,000, one >\$50,000) to NEWAA and NEFAA for review, amendment and approval.
- NEWAA/NEFAA provides authority for WMI to request full proposals from up to 2 applicants per RCN (i.e. 14 in 2007/08)
- WMI provides a letter of invitation to successful pre-proposal applicants to submit full proposal
- WMI notifies and thanks unsuccessful pre-proposal applicants

August 15

- Full proposals due to WMI
- WMI circulates full proposals to Technical Coordinators and NEWDTC committee members with instructions on ranking criteria

September (mid)

- Chairman/Vice Chairman of NEWDTC facilitates review of full suite of full proposals at fall meeting of NEWDTC

- Ranked list of prioritized full proposals returned to WMI (e.g. in 2007/08, ranked proposals from 1...14) with notation as to the outcome of state voting.
- WMI provides ranked list to NEWA/NEFA with instructions on ranking criteria and outcomes of state voting

October - December

- NEWA/NEFA amends or approves ranked list via action item at fall meeting, conference call and/or email ballot organized by WMI.
- WMI presents ranked list of projects to Directors as an action item at their fall meeting (or replacement thereof) for amendment or final approval
- WMI notifies and thanks unsuccessful applicants
- WMI secures contractual agreements on behalf of NEAFWRA with all approved project investigators
- WMI develops and provides to all states a Project 2: Federal Aid Grant Amendment
- WMI invoices on behalf of Association for project funds from all states as per Project 2 Amendment
- WMI through the Chairman/Vice Chairman of NEWDTTC solicits RCN topic areas from committee members. Committee members are expected to query others within their agency. Members are also expected to identify or volunteer to be authors willing to perform the duties of RCN Technical Coordinator.

December

- Draft RCN topic areas returned to WMI
- WMI circulates draft RCN topic areas to full committee of NEWDTTC for review and ranking

January 15

- NEWDTTC rankings due back to WMI

January 30

- WMI circulates ranked RCNs to NEWAA/NEFAA

February 15

- NEWAA/NEFAA rankings of RCNs due back to WMI

February 15 – March 15

- WMI provides draft RFP for review, amendment and approval by NEWAA/NEFAA

April at Northeast Conference

- WMI provides Agency Directors draft list RFP for their review, possible amendment, and approval

States commit administration funds and activate Project 1 Federal Aid grants

APPENDIX 2: Technical Coordinator Roles and Responsibilities

Technical Coordinator Job Description

- Proven expertise in the science foundation of regional conservation issues
- Familiar with State Wildlife Action Plans from the states in the Northeast Region
- Coordinators may be a member of the Northeast Wildlife Diversity Technical Committee, NEWAA, NEFAA, any of the other NEAFWRA technical committees.
- Coordinators may also come from outside state agencies and represent an NGO, academic institution, professional society or federal agency.

Responsibilities of Technical Coordinators

Development of RCN Proposals

- Develop RCN proposal including a needs statement and a description of potential products to be achieved through the grant for review by NEWDTC (Note methods, timeline and budget can be estimated but is not necessary).
- Defend RCN in response to review from NEWDTC

If RCN is Chosen:

- Assist in preparation of RFP
- Assemble review team
- Review RFP-generated pre-proposals, suggest revisions and rank
- Recommend 0, 1, or 2 pre-proposals to receive invitation for full proposal
- Review full proposals

For Proposals Chosen for Funding within the RCN:

- Approve and authorize disbursement of project funds by approving project interim invoices
- Monitor progress and approve progress reports from project
- Provide final certification that project objectives are met and final project payment can be made