

**RANKING SCORES:**

		Ranking: 1–5	Ranking: 1–5 (x2)	Ranking: 1–5	Ranking: 1–5	Total (out of 25)		
Project Number	Project Title	Critical Question	Scientific Uncertainty	Geographic Application	Collaboration & Feasibility	Overall Ranking	EMC Funding Request	Ranking Results: # initial EMC Member Supporting/Not Supporting
EMC-2024-001	Balancing fuel considerations and rare carnivore habitat: an evaluation of risk and reward	3.3	6.8	2.7	3.7	16.5	\$74,862 - \$315,3889	3 - Option 1: \$74,862 1 - Option 2: \$262,784 4 - Option 3: \$315,389 2 - do not support 2 - Recusals
EMC-2024-002	Soil, plant, and hydrologic dynamics as indicators of ecosystem function and fire vulnerability across diverse forest health and fuel reduction treatments in the Coast Forest Southern Sub-District	3.6	7.2	3.3	3.9	18	\$358,978 - \$410,440	4 - Option 1: \$358,978 2 - Option 2: \$410,440 6 - do not support 0 - Recusals
EMC-2024-004	Establishing a Survey Protocol for Marbled Murrelet Using Passive Acoustic Technology (Phase 1)	3.4	6.3	2.9	3.8	16.4	\$ 351,706.63	8 - \$351,701 1 - half of funds in first year, full thereafter 1 - do not support 2 - Recusals

**RANKING SCORES:**

		Ranking: 1-5	Ranking: 1-5 (x2)	Ranking: 1-5	Ranking: 1-5	Total (out of 25)		
Project Number	Project Title	Critical Question	Scientific Uncertainty	Geographic Application	Collaboration & Feasibility	Overall Ranking	EMC Funding Request	Ranking Results: # initial EMC Member Supporting/Not Supporting
EMC-2024-006	Reforestation for Resilience: Evaluating Climate-Smart Reforestation Techniques in California's Mixed Conifer and Yellow Pine Forests	3.9	7.7	4.25	4.25	20.1	\$ 321,921.68	9 - \$322,921 1 - half of funds in first year, full thereafter 2 - do not support 0 - Recusals

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