**Nez Perce National Historic Trail**
**Challenge Cost Share Program Application Ranking Criteria**

***The purpose of the Nez Perce National Historic Trail cost share program is to collaborate with various and diverse partners to identify and comprehensively protect the historical, natural, cultural, sacred, and recreational resources related to the 1877 Nez Perce war; interpret the histories of those resources; educate the public on their significance and value; and provide appropriate opportunities for their public use.***

1) **Project Meets a Critical Need:** 45 pts

The proposal must demonstrate that, if funded, the project will address a critical resource or visitor use management need or issue related to the Trail's purpose, as described above.

| | |
|---|---|
| Project is urgently needed to protect resource(s) or serve visitors. The project will address a high level threat to resources or provide a high level service improvement for the public. | 45 pts |
| Project is less urgently needed to protect resource(s) or serve visitors. The project will address a moderately high level threat to resources or provide a moderately high level of service improvement for the public. | 30 pts |
| Project is needed to protect a resource or serve visitors but is not extremely urgent | 15 pts |
| Project provides only marginal benefit for protecting resource(s) or serving visitors. | 0 pts |

2) **Partnership Participation:** 35 pts

- The proposal ensures and demonstrates active and full support, partnership, sponsorship, and participation by non-FS entities ensuring a strong collaborative effort. All parties involved in the project benefit from its completion with work potentially strengthening a cooperative relationship between the FS and the partner(s). New partnerships, innovative/creative partnerships and multi-partner projects are encouraged.
- Supporting letters from potential partners must accompany the proposal to document the willingness to participate in the project if funded.

| | |
|---|---|
| The nature of the partnership is exemplary. Ideally, the project establishes a new or innovative partnership or is a multi-partner project. The project will have active involvement by all partners who assume their respective responsibilities for the project. | 35 pts |
| Partnership is rather traditional in terms of innovation and type of partners selected. One partner assumes a proportionately greater share of responsibilities for the project. | 23 pts |
| Partnership is not new or innovative. The project appears to be a pass through for money with the partner(s) implementing the project without substantive involvement on all parts. | 0 pts |

3) **Tangible Results:** 10 pts

The proposal adequately describes the needs to be addressed and the outcomes and products of the project. In addition, the quality and usefulness of the products are adequately described. Within reason, the project adheres to a one year time frame.

| | |
|---|---|
| Project is planned for completion at the proposed funding level, within the one-year time frame, and will produce high quality and useful results. Needed expertise has been identified and compliance requirements will be met. | 10 pts |
| Project is likely to be completed in one year, but portions of the project implementation are unclear either due to a lack of clarity of required roles or expertise. | 5 pts |
| Project time frame far exceeds one year in time. Quality of intended results is unclear. Required expertise is unidentified and compliance issues are unaddressed. | 0 pts |

4) **Cost Effectiveness:** 10pts

The budget is well developed and reflects reasonable costs and allocation of funds.

| | |
|---|---|
| All work elements are specifically identified with their associated costs; all expenses are necessary, reasonable and appropriate. Partner costs are clearly identified. | 10 pts |
| Most work elements are specifically identified with their associated costs; most expenses are necessary, reasonable and appropriate. Partner costs are identified. | 5 pts |
| Work elements are not identified with their associated costs; expenses do not appear necessary, reasonable and appropriate. Partner costs are not clearly identified. | 0 pts |

5) **Exceeding the required 50:50 Match: 5pts OPTIONAL**

- The non-Federal contribution(s) of funds or in-kind services must be at least 50% of the project total. Up to five additional points may be given to proposals that exceed the 50:50 match, that discretion will be left to the coordinator and review panel.