

2. Project Schedule and Plan of Work (Timetable)

Excellent:	Thorough description of how the project will be implemented. Includes a detailed plan of work and timetable indicating approximately when each activity will be carried out and project completed.
Good:	Similar to above but may lack tasks that need to be completed or other minor information.
Fair:	Includes a project implementation description, but lacks detail and timetable.
Poor:	Project implementation plan and time table is vague and time. Project will probably get done, but planning appears to be lacking.
Unacceptable:	Project implementation plan is unrealistic or nonexistent. Doubtful that project will be completed.

3. Species Selection (The commonly used names for plant and animal taxa sometimes correspond to species: Examples: ash – oak – maple – apple)

(There is a need to increase the species diversity of our community forests to help offset the threat of invasive or non-native insects and diseases. If your community has a high percentage of one or two species, such as Ash, Elm, or Boxelder then planting other species like Oak, Linden, Hackberry, or other species is essential avoid a similar problem that we have experienced with Dutch Elm Disease and the American Elm. Species diversity is emphasized when scoring grant applications.

Excellent:	Five (5) or more <u>species</u> that are appropriate for the site.
Good:	Four (4) or more <u>species</u> that are appropriate for the site.
Fair:	Three (3) <u>species</u> that are appropriate for the site.
Poor:	Two (2) <u>species</u> that are appropriate for the site.
Unacceptable:	No or only one specific species (monoculture) indicated.

Note: Selecting the **right species** for the proposed site is critical, and should be reflected in rating.

If you would like help in determining what type of tree species that your have in you community please contact a member of the Community Forestry Team. We would be willing to arrange a date and time to visit your community.

4. Project Budget

Excellent:	Project budget leaves no doubt that the associated costs are adequate and realistic to complete the project. The amount and type of match meet the project requirements.
Good:	Similar to above, but less detail.
Fair:	Some questions regarding the use of budget funds, though still a good project.
Poor:	Vague detail as to the use of budget funds.
Unacceptable:	Poor justification for utilization of funds.

5. Project Innovation/Community Benefits

Excellent:	Project is unique to the community and/or provides three (3) or more types of benefits, such as economic development, entrance beautification, wildlife enhancement, outdoor classroom, screening, or other benefits identified by the community.
Good:	Project is unique to community and/or provides one (1) or two (2) types of benefits.
Fair:	Project is not necessarily innovative or unique but provides at least one benefit to the community.
Poor:	Project is not unique to the community and its benefits are questionable.
Unacceptable:	Project provides no obvious community benefits.

6. Project Design Plan/Vicinity Map/Photos

Excellent:	Application includes vicinity maps showing location of project within the community/area along with a map showing the area of the project and surrounding area. Design plan is drawn to scale. Plan shows where each tree will be located and identifies each location by tree species. Plan includes a plant materials list summarizing species, size, and quantity. Photo(s) show project site and reveal need for the project.
Good:	Similar to above, but vicinity maps, designs plan, or photos could be improved.
Fair:	This is the highest rating available for applications lacking either photos or a vicinity maps, but containing a design plan.
Poor:	Design plan not to scale. Locations of proposed trees are vague and do not specify species. Plan indicates the project, but very poorly. Design plan located on vicinity map.
Unacceptable:	No design plan and no indication of one.

7. Public Access

Excellent:	Project is accessible, free of charge to the general public. The project is beneficial and accessible to the general public for multiple uses/activities, including visual, physical, and social.
Good:	Project accessible, free of charge, but accessible to fewer members of the general public or for fewer uses/activities.
Fair:	Project accessible to general public, but for a fee. Community still benefits due to project location.
Poor:	Project accessible to the general public, but for a fee. Benefits to the community are limited because of location or not clearly stated.
Unacceptable:	Project is not accessible to the general public.