

## FHP Report Card

**FHP**

**Atlantic Coast Fish Habitat Partnership**

**Board Review Score**

**91.93**

Question	Scoring scales	Score
Do the proposed projects meet ACE Act "Hard" requirements #2 - #5?	Yes (score of 5 for all projects)= 30; Partial (some of projects with score of 5) = 15; None of projects with score of 5= 0	30.00
ACE ACT "Hard" Requirement - Are there clear, informative descriptions of ecological benefits, and measurable goals and objectives?	0-10 (0: not included, 10: all included and very clear)	8.20
ACE ACT "Hard" Requirement - Did the FHP clearly provide justification for why the project was selected and a summary of project sponsor experience?	0-10 (0: not included, 10: all included and very clear)	9.20
Did the FHP request base operational funds? (Y/N)	Yes or No	Yes
ACE ACT "Hard" Requirement - Is there 1:1 non-Federal financial match for the base operational funds request?	Yes or No	No
ACE ACT "Hard" Requirement - Will 1:1 matching requirements be satisfied for the full FHP proposal overall (across all proposed projects - *EXCEPT Tribal projects)?	0-10 (0: no match, 10: meets or exceeds 1:1 match requirement)	10.00
	Match Funding (cash & in-kind): NFHP Request Ratio	3.84
Does the project meet "SOFT" requirements?	0-20 (0: projects do not meet a minimum of 6 requirements, 20: all projects meets at least 10 of the soft criteria)	17.53
Is there a clear description of FY22/23 project status?	Yes or No	Yes
Does the application include a clear justification for operational support funding?	0-10	9.00
Assess the overall FHP application package (e.g. overall application and performance, including cover letter, partnership accomplishments, and work plan)	0-10	8.00
Score Subtotal	Hard Criteria	57.40
	Soft Criteria	17.53
	Overall Package	17.00
	<b>Total Score</b>	<b>91.93</b>

## Board Review Comment Summary

- Application included strong on-the-ground projects; operational project was weak in its response to hard criteria 2 & 4 as well as the operational funding justification.
- A good and complete set of proposals which provide for both operations and some good projects with the potential to scale up to other areas in the FHP.
- Report did a good job of articulating the challenges the FHP is currently undergoing re: administrative functions (Coordinator transition, staffing limitations, project management infrastructure). Since they have so many projects that are still 'active', I think it is wise that the FHP is limiting the number of additional projects proposed this year.
- Excellent evaluations and matching. Large service area managed well.

Overall Comment to all FHP's:

FHPs are encouraged to use their cover letters to put the project they are proposing into the larger context of their existing portfolio of work, etc. Introductory about the history of the FHP and its mission is not needed, but understanding how the requested funding/projects serve to further the FHP's purpose and fit into ongoing workplans would be valuable.

This can also feed into general advice about filling out information in the database re: why the project was selected. Don't just say "the project was selected because it was highly ranked".

### **Tier and Estimated FY 24 Funding Summary**

Your FHP fell in Tier 1.

Based on FY 23 funding levels, we ***\*\*estimate\*\**** that you will receive approximately \$300,000 in NFHP funding for FY 24.

*\*\*Please note: this funding amount is for your information, and is not final. It is an estimated funding level, and this may change depending on the total NFHP funding received for FY 24. Also, depending on available funding and funding overflow from FHPs, there may be additional funds made available for your projects, increasing your funding level.*