Ranking of Proposals Submitted for Fiscal Year ***** Grant Cycle

	PROPOSAL TITLE	CRITERIA 1	2	3	4	5	6	Score	additional comments (qualitative analysis of the proposal)	
1	Fawn resule	4.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	18.00	vann 22, matigan 17 -lack of experence managing grants, pallesen 20 experences, 18 neumann, pellar not voting	19.25
2	CDA	3.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	18.00	vann 23, matigan 17-seems like not enough funds for the total project, pallsene 23, pellar 16, neumann 18	19.4
3	MLT	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	20.00	vann 21, matigan 19, pallsene 17-pilot program, pellar 20, neumann 20	19.4

Neumann

	Commissioner Score					
Grant Name	Vann	Pellar	Madigan	Pallesen	Neumann	Average
Mendocino Wildlife	22	x	17	20	18	19.25
California Deer Associate	23	16	17	23	18	19.4
Mendocino Land Trust	21	19	19	17	20	19.2

Neumann

Ranking of Proposals Submitted for Fiscal Year ***** Grant Cycle

	PROPOSAL TITLE	CRITERIA 1	2	3	4	5	6	Score	additional comments (qualitative analysis of the proposal)
1	Mendocino Wildlife Association	4.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	3.0	3.0	20.00	
2	California Deer Association	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.0	4.0	23.00	
3	MLT	4.0	4.0	3.0	2.0	4.0	4.0	17.00	
4									
5									
5									

Pallesen

Mendocino County Fish and Game Commission

Ranking of Proposals Submitted for Fiscal Year ***** Grant Cycle

RANDALL VANN

	PROPOSAL TITLE	CRITERIA 1	2	3	4	5	6	Score		additional comments (qualitative analysis of the proposal)
1	Mendo Land Trust	3	3	4	3	4	4	21	#3	Great preventive approach.
2	Hawthorn Lake	3	4	4	4	4	4	23	#1	Good use of funds and will work well with funds awarded by the groups
3	Mendo Wildlife	3	4	4	3	4	4	22	#2	Very good plan for helping and returning struggling wildlife to the wild.
4										
5										
6										

Vann

Criteria for Assessing Grant Applications to the Mendocino County Fish & Game Commission (Version 3.0 – Jan. 2015)

	CRITERIA	WAY TO MEASURE IT	RANKING
1	Meets Fish & Game Code Sections and Restrictions Mendo Wildlife: 3 CA Deer Assn.: 3 MLT: 3	Explicit statements in the grant proposal describing which section(s) of the code the activities match up with	0 = **no** sections mentioned in the application or implied 1 = sections mentioned; but **no description** provided 2 = sections mentioned; **inadequate** description provided 3 = sections mentioned with **adequate** description 4 = sections mentioned; description **clearly and fully** demonstrates all proposed activities match with code
2	Work proposed is feasible Mendo Wildlife: 3 CA Deer Assn.: 2 MLT: 3	Methods are clearly outlined and detailed with attached calendar schedule of activities	0 = methods are **not mentioned** 1 = methods are mentioned; but **no details** provided 2 = methods are partially and **inadequately** detailed 3 = methods are **adequately** detailed but **no clear schedule** 4 = methods are **clearly and fully detailed with calendar schedule**
3	Work benefits the local ecology Mendo Wildlife: 3 CA Deer Assn.: 3 MLT: 3	Proposed activities contribute to improved habitat and/or increased survivorship	0 = activities have **no** [in]direct positive impact on local ecology 1 = activities have an **indirect positive** impact on local ecology 2 = activities have a **potential, but unclear direct positive** impact 3 = activities have a **clear and direct positive short-term** impact 4 = activities have a **clear and direct positive short-term and long-term** impact

Madigan

4	Work benefits hunting and fishing opportunities Mendo Wildlife: 3 CA Deer Assn.: 3 MLT: 3	Proposed activities contribute to hunting and fishing opportunities	0 = activities **do not contribute positively** to hunting and fishing opportunities. 1 = activities **indirectly contribute** positively to hunting and fishing opportunities. 2 = activities have a **potential, but unclear direct positive** impact. 3 = activities have a **clear and direct positive short-term** impact. 4 = activities have a **clear and direct positive short-term and long-term** impact.
5	Applicant(s) work(s) well and cooperatively with related agencies Mendo Wildlife: 2 CA Deer Assn.: 3 MLT: 4	Applicant(s) is/are recognized professionally and known for positive collaborative relationships	-5 = applicants have a known, and **negative** history with local agencies 0 = applicants have **no** known professional recognition, and **no** known collaborative history with local agencies 1 = applicant(s) **are recognized** professionally for their contributions; but have **no** known collaborative history with local agencies 2 = applicant(s) **are recognized** professionally and have **minimal** collaborative history with local agencies 3 = applicant(s) **are recognized** professionally and have a **positive and longer-term** collaborative history with local agencies 4 = applicant(s) **are recognized** professionally and have an **excellent and long-term** collaborative history with local agencies
6	Proposed activities represent the "best use" of limited Commission funds Mendo Wildlife: 3 CA Deer Assn.: 3 MLT: 3	Proposal demonstrates efficient and effective use of the Commission's limited funds	0 = Effectiveness is **vague.** 1 = Effectiveness is **partially** clear. 2 = Effectiveness is **clear**, but **some activities are questionable.** 3 = Effectiveness is **clear** and **all activities are effective.** 4 = Effectiveness is **clear**, **all activities are effective** and the applicant(s) is/are **leveraging or matching the funds requested.** **Total Scores:** Mendo Wildlife: 17 CA Deer Assn.: 17 MLT: 19

Mendocino County Fish and Game Commission

Ranking of Proposals Submitted for Fiscal Year *** Grant Cycle**

	PROPOSAL TITLE	CRITERIA 1	2	3	4	5	6	Score	additional comments (qualitative analysis of the proposal)
1	Fawn Rescue-MWA- Traci Pellar Recused							N/A	
2	MLT-Bear Proof Trash Can match-	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.0	4.0	4.0	20.00	
3	Hammer Horn Campgroud- Rebuild ADA-	3.0	3.0	0.0	4.0	3.0	3.0	16.00	
4									
5									
5									

Pellar