Number Project Title Question (5) Uncertainty (10) Application (5) Feasibility (5) Ranking (5) Request (\$) Comments 2022-001 Aquatic Toxicity & Cumulative Watershed Effects of Pesticide Discharge Related to Post-Fire Reforestation 2022-003 Santa Cruz Mountains Post-Fire Redwood Defect Study 2022-004 A critical evaluation of Forest Practice Regulation's capacity to accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets	Р	ROJECT INFORMATION	RANKING						
Aquatic Toxicity & Cumulative Watershed Effects of Pesticide Discharge Related to Post-Fire Reforestation 2022-003 Santa Cruz Mountains Post-Fire Redwood Defect Study 2022-004 A critical evaluation of Forest Practice Regulation's capacity to accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets 2022-005 Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests - Critical Question(s) 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 Critical question application. - Collaboration Speciation Application Application. - Collaboration Speciation Application. - Collaboration Speciation Application Application. - Collaboration Speciation Application Application. - Collaboration Speciation Application Application Application. - Collaboration Speciation Application Application Application. - Collaboration Speciation Application Application Application Application. - Collaboration Speciation Application Application Application Application. - Collaboration Application Application Application Application Application Application. - Collaboration Speciation Application Application Application Application. - Collaboration Application	Project		Critical	Scientific	Geographic	Collaboration &	Overall	EMC Funding	
Watershed Effects of Pesticide Discharge Related to Post-Fire Reforestation 2022-003 Santa Cruz Mountains Post-Fire Redwood Defect Study 2022-004 A critical evaluation of Forest Practice Regulation's capacity to accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets 2022-005 Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests - Critical Question(s) 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 - Collaboration - Reasibility - Seasibility of monitoring project to meet stated goals and objectives within expected budget and timelines needed by the EMC, Board or stakeholders. On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal: 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 3 = May meet some portions of the Ranking 4 either key or ancillary	Number	Project Title	Question (5)	Uncertainty (10)	Application (5)	Feasibility (5)	Ranking (5)	Request (\$)	Comments
Discharge Related to Post-Fire Reforestation 2022-003 Santa Cruz Mountains Post-Fire Redwood Defect Study 2022-004 A critical evaluation of Forest Practice Regulation's capacity to accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests	2022-001	· ·							
Reforestation Santa Cruz Mountains Post-Fire Redwood Defect Study 2022-004 A critical evaluation of Forest Practice Regulation's capacity to accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets 2022-005 Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests									
2022-003 Santa Cruz Mountains Post-Fire Redwood Defect Study 2022-004 A critical evaluation of Forest Practice Regulation's capacity to accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets 2022-005 Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests		_							
Redwood Defect Study 2022-004 A critical evaluation of Forest Practice Regulation's capacity to accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets 2022-005 Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests Critical Question(s) questions with appropriate study design and experimental methods. Scientific Uncertainty weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings. Geographic Application Application Application Critical question and proposed project has broad geographic Application Application 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 Application Application Scientific Uncertainty weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings. Geographic Application Application Application Scientific Uncertainty weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings. Geographic Application Application Application Scientific Uncertainty weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings. Geographic Application Application Application Scientific Uncertainty weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings. Geographic Application Application Application Scientific Uncertainty weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings. Geographic Application Application Application Application Scientific Uncertainty weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings. Geographic Application Appl	2022.002								
A critical evaluation of Forest Practice Regulation's capacity to accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests Critical Question(s) 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 application. Collaboration & Feasibility 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 application. Proposed monitoring project addresses one or more EMC critical monitoring weighted in the result of the critical question and experimental methods. Scientific Uncertainty Current scientific understanding is not well-studied or validated. This ranking is weighted for their rankings. Geographic Application application. 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. On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal: 1 = Does not meet key portions of the Ranking 2 = Does not meet key portions of the Ranking, either key or ancillary	2022-003								
A critical evaluation of Forest Practice Regulation's capacity to accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets 2022-005 Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests	2022-004	,							
accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests Critical Question(s) 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 application. Collaboration Number of active contributing collaborators relative to the monitoring subject to meet stated goals and objectives within expected budget and timelines needed by the EMC, Board or stakeholders. On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal: 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		A critical evaluation of Forest							
accommodate forest restoration and resilience targets Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests Critical Question(s) 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 application. Collaboration Number of active contributing collaborators relative to the monitoring subject to meet stated goals and objectives within expected budget and timelines needed by the EMC, Board or stakeholders. On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal: 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		Practice Regulation's capacity to							
and resilience targets Decay rate and fire behavior of post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests Critical Question(s) 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 application. Collaboration Number of active contributing collaborators relative to the monitoring subject. Consider the magnitude and expertise of the collaborators. Feasibility 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. On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal: 1 = Does not meet any portion of the Ranking 2 = Does not meet key portions of the Ranking, either key or ancillary									
post-harvest slash in coastal redwood forests - Critical Question(s) 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 Critical question and proposed project has broad geographic Application application Collaboration Number of active contributing collaborators relative to the monitoring subject. Consider the magnitude and expertise of the collaborators Feasibility 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 On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal: - 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									
Critical Question(s) 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 Critical question and proposed project has broad geographic Application. Collaboration 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. On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal: 1 = Does not meet any portion of the Ranking 2 = Does not meet key portions of the Ranking, either key or ancillary	2022-005	Decay rate and fire behavior of							
Critical Question(s) 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 Critical question and proposed project has broad geographic Application. Collaboration 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. On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal: 1 = Does not meet any portion of the Ranking 2 = Does not meet key portions of the Ranking, either key or ancillary		post-harvest slash in coastal							
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 Critical question and proposed project has broad geographic Application application. Collaboration Number of active contributing collaborators relative to the monitoring subject. Consider the magnitude and expertise of the collaborators. Feasibility 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. On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal: 1 = Does not meet any portion of the Ranking 2 = Does not meet key portions of the Ranking, either key or ancillary		redwood forests							
5 = Meets all portions of the Ranking			 weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings. Geographic Critical question and proposed project has broad geographic application. Collaboration 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. On a categorical scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal: 1 = Does not meet any portion of the Ranking 2 = Does not meet key portions of the Ranking, either key or ancillary 4 = Meets key portions of the Ranking and does not address ancillary portions 						
5 = Micets an portions of the Nariking			3 - Wiccis all p	or the Name	8				