

<p style="text-align: center;">LOCAL COOPERATIVE EVALUATION CRITERIA Use Only for Local Cooperatives Projects</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Scoring Range</p>
<p>1) This project includes collaborative resources from private, state, and/or federal sources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = The project only includes resources from one source, including support and match (private, state, or federal sources). • 1-3 = The project includes resources from two different sources, including support and match (private, state, or federal sources) and the description of participation may lack detail. • 4-6 = The project includes resources from three different sources, including support and match (private, state, or federal sources) but the description of participation lacks detail. • 7-9 = The project includes resources from four or more different sources, including support and match (private, state, or federal sources) and provides some description of participation. • 10 = The project shows a collaboration of resources from various sources, including support and match (private, state, or federal sources) and provides a detailed description of participation for each. 	<p style="text-align: center;">0 - 10</p>
<p>2) This project involves management of high priority noxious weeds for the state and/or project area within the county or counties.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = The project does not target any high priority noxious weeds in the state or county. • 1-3 = The project targets only priority 2B noxious weeds in the state. • 4-6 = The project targets only priority 2A noxious weeds in the state. • 7-9 = The project targets one or more high priority noxious weeds for the county. • 10 = The project targets one or more high priority noxious weeds for the state and/or is part of an EDRR effort. 	<p style="text-align: center;">0 - 10</p>
<p>3) The project meets Cooperative Weed Management Area (CWMA) criteria efforts as described in the Montana State Weed Management Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = The project does not meet the criteria efforts as described in the WMP and cooperation/collaboration seems to be lacking. • 1-3 = The project meets one or two of the criteria efforts as described in the WMP but overall, the CWMA is not organized. • 4-6 = The project meets three or four of the criteria efforts as described in the WMP and the CWMA is somewhat organized. • 7-9 = The project meets most of the criteria efforts as described in the WMP and the CWMA is somewhat organized. • 10 = The project meets most or all of the criteria efforts as described in the WMP and the CWMA is clearly organized with scheduled meetings, a weed plan, and active participation. 	<p style="text-align: center;">0 - 10</p>

<p>4) This project utilizes integrated management techniques that are both appropriate and applicable for the noxious weed species to be treated in the designated area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = Applicant does not describe any integrated management techniques being used in the project. Only one management method is being used. • 1-4 = Applicant describes integrated management techniques being used in the project, and/or the methods are not appropriate or directly related to management of noxious weeds (i.e. grazing cattle). • 5-9 = Applicant describes two integrated management techniques being used in the project, both of which are appropriate and applicable. • 10-14 = Applicant clearly describes three or more integrated management techniques being used in the project, all of which are appropriate and applicable. • 15 = Applicant describes in detail several integrated management techniques being used in the project, including planning and evaluation, and it is clear the group has gone above and beyond to improve the landscape. 	0 - 15
<p>5) This project incorporates an appropriate annual monitoring plan that will effectively track progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = Applicant does not provide an appropriate annual monitoring plan. • 1-3 = Applicant provides an annual monitoring plan, but it will not effectively track progress. • 4-6 = Applicant provides an appropriate annual monitoring plan that may effectively track progress but did not provide a detailed description. • 7-9 = Applicant provides an appropriate annual monitoring plan that may effectively track progress and provides some detail like timing and locations. • 10 = Applicant provides a clear and detailed plan for effectively tracking progress. Methods are appropriate and can be sustained for several years. 	0 - 10
<p>6) Project participants are actively mapping weed infestations by using or sharing data on EDDMapS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = Project participants do not map weed infestations and/or share data with EDDMapS. • 3 = Some project participants map weed infestations and use or share with EDDMapS. Maps have been provided in application. • 5 = Most or all project participants map weed infestations and use/share data with EDDMapS. Detailed maps were provided in application. 	0, 3, 5
<p>7) Lists additional and/or in-kind match for project (50% match is required for herbicide, seed, and related labor only).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = No additional match and/or in-kind match. • 3 = Some additional and/or in-kind match is provided but not secured. • 5 = Additional and/or in-kind match is provided and secured. 	0, 3, 5

<p>8) This project incorporates measurable objectives that describe how renewable resources will be enhanced. Objectives should be specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and timely (SMART).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = Applicant did not include any clear objectives. • 1-4 = Applicant included only one or two objectives, but they did not include SMART descriptions or descriptions lacked detail. • 5-9 = Applicant included more than two objectives, but they did not include SMART descriptions or descriptions lacked detail. • 10-14 = Applicant included more than two objectives, and all have SMART descriptions but the plan of work lacks detail or is not efficient to accomplish the project. • 15 = Applicant included a detailed plan of work; all objectives have SMART descriptions; and the plan of work is efficient to accomplish the project. 	0 - 15
<p>9) This project identifies specific education opportunities for land managers targeted in this grant.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0 = The project does not provide educational opportunities for land managers. • 1-3 = Applicant listed educational opportunities in the project, but they were not specific to the participating land managers. • 4-6 = Applicant listed one educational opportunity for land managers in the project but did not provide any detail. • 7-9 = Applicant listed one or two educational opportunities for land managers in the project and provided some details. • 10 = Applicant listed more than two educational opportunities targeted specifically to the land managers in the project and provided an adequate description and detail. 	0 – 10
<p>10) This application was well prepared, the group is well organized, and the project reflects a likelihood of success in meeting the goals and objectives set forth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-3 = Application was not well prepared, was missing information, lacked detail, methods and evaluation is not organized or appropriate, and it is unlikely the developer will meet the goals and objectives set forth. • 4-7 = Application included all necessary information but lacked detail, methods and evaluation was not clear and/or appropriate, and the developer may struggle meeting the goals and objectives set forth. • 7-10 = Application included detailed and specific information including clear and appropriate methods and evaluation, and there is confidence that the developer will meet the goals and objectives set forth. 	0 - 10