

New Definitions for Scoring Criteria

Effective beginning in 2008

Private Cost-Share Grants

33.50(5) Project selection criteria. The committee shall evaluate and rank the resource enhancement and protection (REAP) private cost–share grant applications, scoring each criteria from 1 to 10, low to high, and use the following multipliers for each criteria:

a. The committee shall use a multiplier of three for each of the following:

(1) Level of significance. The relative rarity of the natural resources found on the project site, including but not limited to native vegetation and the documented presence of species of greatest conservation need as defined by the Iowa Wildlife Action Plan as developed by the department and as may be amended from time-to-time, or other uncommonly occurring but native resources.

(2) Resource representation. The quality of the project site, including but not limited to the size and diversity of the project area and the vegetation and wildlife it supports.

(3) Level of threat. Specific factors and immediate threats to the project area that constitute urgency for acquisition and development, including but not limited to urban expansion, residential development, agricultural activities, or clearing.

(4) Relation to public land. The proximity to existing wildlife management areas, existing parks, and other public recreation or greenbelt areas already under public ownership and management.

(5) Relationship to relevant regional and statewide programs. A demonstrated relationship to the state comprehensive outdoor recreation plan, the Iowa open spaces protection plan or the county resource enhancement plan. The committee may evaluate other relevant local, state and federal plans at its discretion.

b. The committee shall use a multiplier of two for each of the following:

(1) Rare or unique species communities. The documented presence of species of greatest conservation need, as defined by the Iowa Wildlife Action Plan as developed by the department and as may be amended from time to time, in addition to 33.50(5)“a”(1).

(2) Public benefits. A demonstrated benefit to the public, including but not limited to expanded recreational or educational opportunities and incorporation of land improvements that may have a positive impact on the ecosystem, such as bank stabilization, wetland development, or filter strips.

c. The committee shall use a multiplier of one for each of the following:

(1) Tourism and economic development potential. Impact on local tourism, including any enhancements to the economy in the vicinity of the project.

(2) Geographic distribution. Project site is located in a city or county that has not received a REAP grant.

(3) Multiple use potential. Project site provides more than one public use, e.g., the project provides hunting, fishing and hiking opportunities to the public.

(4) Additional funds. Level of funds obligated in excess of the minimum cost–share requirements.

(5) Quality of public communication plan. Project sponsor’s effort to inform and advise constituents and users about the importance of the proposed project, and plans to promote the proposed project to expected user groups.