

APPENDIX F: RANKING OF PROPOSED EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING PROJECTS¹

Project Number	Project Title	Critical Question	Scientific Uncertainty	Geographic Application	Collaboration & Feasibility	Budget Request	Overall Ranking
Example: EMC-15-001							

Ranking Method for Monitoring Projects

Critical Question: Proposed monitoring project addresses one or more EMC critical monitoring questions with appropriate study design and experimental methods.

Scientific Uncertainty: Current scientific understanding is not well-studied or validated. This ranking is weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings.

Geographic Application: Critical question and proposed project has broad geographic application.

Collaboration & Feasibility: Number of active contributing collaborators relative to the monitoring subject. Consider the magnitude and expertise of the collaborators. Feasibility of monitoring project to meet stated goals and objectives within expected budget and timelines needed by the EMC, Board or stakeholders.

Budget Request: The amount of funds requested from the EMC.

On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing any category:

- 1 = Does not meet any portion of the Ranking
- 2 = Does not meet key portions of the Ranking
- 3 = May meet some portions of the Ranking, either key or ancillary
- 4 = Meets key portions of the Ranking and does not address ancillary portions
- 5 = Meets all portions of the Ranking

¹ Additional guidance for ranking criteria follows on the next page.

Supplemental Information for Ranking Method

Project Ranking Method

EMC projects will be evaluated in April and October. Proposals received by 5 pm on March 15th will be reviewed in April and proposals received by 5 pm on September 15th will be reviewed in October. Ranking results will be posted on the EMC website and project proponents will be notified of the results. All monitoring project proposals and the ranking results will be made publicly available on the EMC web site. If an EMC member is the principal investigator, the EMC member will recuse themselves from ranking their proposal.

Project Ranking

EMC members will individually rank each project and then the EMC will evaluate the average scores to determine which studies the EMC supports, and if funding is required, whether to help fund the project. No absolute ranking score is required for support and funding; rather individual project scores will be considered relative to other scores.

Category Summaries

Critical Question

Projects that address one or more EMC critical themes (out of the ten possible) and multiple critical questions within a given theme will be ranked higher than those that only address a single theme and critical question. Additionally, projects must describe appropriate study design and methods to adequately address the proposed critical question(s).

Scientific Uncertainty

Projects will be ranked higher when our current scientific understanding of forest practice effectiveness in the California Forest Practice Rules and other natural resource protection statutes and laws, codes and regulations is not well understood.. A goal is to promote projects that address large gaps in the knowledge of the effectiveness of forest practices in California. Projects should propose to investigate high priority critical monitoring themes (Strategic Plan Section 2.3) related to maintaining or enhancing water quality, aquatic habitat, and wildlife habitats.

Geographic Application

Proposed projects that have broad application throughout California forestlands will be ranked higher than those with application limited to a specific geomorphic region or sub-region. However, projects need not be physically located throughout California to produce findings that apply to multiple areas in the state.

Collaboration & Feasibility

Projects will receive higher ranking when they have a broad array of collaborative partners involved with substantive expertise in the proposed study. This is to encourage multidisciplinary approaches in the proposals. Project proponents are encouraged to collaborate with state and federal agencies, universities, private industry, NGOs, watershed groups, etc. Past performance in delivering acceptable monitoring reports within available budgets in a timely manner will be considered.