

RANKING OF PROPOSED EFFECTIVENESS MONITORING PROJECTS¹

Project Number	Project Title	Critical Question	Scientific Uncertainty	Geographic Application	Collaboration & Feasibility	Overall Ranking	EMC Funding Request*

*not included in ranking score

Ranking Method for Monitoring Projects	
RANKING CATEGORY	KEY CRITERIA
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 weighted twice (2 times) that 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.
ON A CATEGORICAL SCALE OF 1 TO 5, REVIEWERS SHOULD REFER TO THE FOLLOWING GUIDANCE WHEN REVIEWING ANY CATEGORY:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 The metrics used for ranking EMC projects were modeled on the Cooperative, Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Committee (CEMR) (established by the State of Washington Forest Practices Board) general method for ranking projects. This was deemed prudent during the initial formation of the EMC as CEMR is roughly similar in scope and mission as the EMC, and is a well-respected governmental advisory committee (<https://www.dnr.wa.gov/about/boards-and-councils/forest-practices-board/cooperative-monitoring-evaluation-and-research>).

