

**Aquatic Invasive Species Control Grants**  
**Project Ranking for Subchapter IV – Established Population Control Projects**

33 points possible

May, 2009

**A) The degree to which the project includes a prevention and control strategy.**

(6 points possible)

- 1) There is, or the project establishes, a local “Clean Boats, Clean Waters” (CBCW) or similar paid or unpaid watercraft inspection boater education effort on the water body (or appropriate method for wetlands) to prevent spread and reintroduction following control. Inspection efforts equal or exceed 200 hours per summer on the controlled water.

**2 points**

- 2) There is, or the project establishes, complimentary source containment activities such as landing modification to facilitate boat cleaning, augmented enforcement, and/or innovative signage improvements (i.e. viewed as leaving the water) on the water body.

**2 points**

- 3) There is, or the project establishes trained volunteers to identify AIS and conduct surveillance monitoring on the controlled water for early detection using accepted Citizen-based Monitoring Network (CBMN/CLMN) protocols.

**1 point**

- 4) The project will fully comply with the Department’s pre and post monitoring guidelines for the target species.

**1 point**

**B) The degree to which the project will prevent the spread of aquatic invasive species.**

(5 points possible)

- 1) The project location is a major statewide source for AIS spread as indicated by the Department’s “smart prevention” analysis. [e.g. multiple AIS at high densities, high public use, significant use by transient boaters, fishing tournament(s), etc.]

**5 points**

**OR**

- 2) The project location is, or includes, a minor source water. A regionally or locally significant source as determined by a “smart prevention” analysis. [e.g. AIS populated water at higher densities with unpopulated waters within a 5 mile radius or a managed water with AIS and light use and remote or limited access.]

**3 points**

- 3) The project location includes other source waters with low access and risk of spread.

**1 point**

**C) The degree to which the project protects or improves the aquatic ecosystem's diversity, ecological stability or recreational uses.**

(3 points possible)

- 1) Project plan implementation includes stocking or planting to reintroduce native community species or implements other actions or changes in management strategies that will provide added protection to native species. (Herbicide treatments alone do not achieve this.)

**2 point**

- 2) Project area has a high degree of native biodiversity or is critical habitat, as expressed by:

- an above eco-region average aquatic or wetland plant FQI
- the presence of a listed aquatic species (NHI endangered, threatened or watch)
- is an ERW or ORW water
- has a Sensitive Area or Critical Habitat designation
- is within or adjacent to a State Natural Area, State Park, other publicly owned unique natural area or such an area owned/managed by a nonprofit conservation organization (e.g., Nature Conservancy).

**1 point**

**D) The stage of the infestation in the water body. (4 points possible)**

- 1) Project addresses a pioneer population (as defined by s.198.12 (8)), is a past early response project or is a prohibited species in ch. NR 40.

**2 point**

- 2) The target species is low in density and still at a controllable level as determined by being found in 25%, or less, of the colonizable area of the project water body (e.g. only the littoral zone of a lake can be colonized by EWM).

**1 point**

- 3) It is well documented (P/I surveys, verified) that the target species is a rapidly expanding population (50% annual increase in aeral coverage) or the water has been classified by the Department as high risk and vulnerable to supporting nuisance levels of the species. Population is still under 25% threshold above.

**1 point**

**E) The degree to which the project will be likely to result in successful long-term control.**

(4 points possible)

- 1) Project design employs multiple strategies to achieve and maintain control objectives [e.g. hand pulling in combination with chemical treatment and biocontrol, draw downs, etc.]

**2 points**

- 2) The project recommends using sound methodology as demonstrated by following an approved statewide management plan for specific AIS, or presenting peer-reviewed literature supporting the proposed control methodology, or presenting documentation of a successful application of the proposed control methodology in a similar waterbody.

**1 point**

- 3) The sponsor has had a pre-application grant scoping consultation with the Department and the application is consistent with the results of those discussions.

**1 point**

**F) The availability of public access to, and public use of, the water body.**

(Score 1a or 1b, then 2; 2 points possible)

- 1a) The lake or river has more than the minimum public boating access as defined in s. NR 1.91 (4) (5) or (6).

**1 point**

**OR**

- 1b) Wetland has public access.

**1 point**

- 2) The water body has significant other public access opportunities such as swimming beaches, park lands, public piers, multiple resorts, etc.

**1 point**

**G) The degree to which the proposed project includes or is complemented by other management efforts including watershed pollution prevention and control, native vegetation protection and restoration and other actions that help control aquatic invasive species or resist future colonization. (2 points possible)**

- 1) Applicant demonstrates that they have implemented, or been a significant participant in, or the project proposes, a shoreland restoration, habitat protection, sediment and nutrient control, water level management or other substantial lake stewardship activity that protects the lake ecosystem. (score 1point per action, provide documentation).

**2 points**

**H) Community support and commitment, including past efforts to control aquatic invasive species. (4 points possible)**

- 1) This is demonstrated by requesting less than the maximum state share cost rate (cash costs) for the total project costs. No more than 25% of the project match can be in-kind or donated labor. The sponsor is requesting:

65% State share **1 point**

**OR**

50% State share **2 points**

- 2) The project has financial support from additional management units, interest groups or organizations committing > 10% of the financial or in-kind local project share.

**1 point**

- 3) The sponsor conducted AIS control, consistent with their Department-approved plan, in the previous season without financial assistance from the State. They may have begun implementation without a grant or received grants in past but did not receive a grant in the past season.

**1 point**

**I) Whether the sponsor has previously received a grant for a similar project for the same water body. (2 points)**

- 1) The project is a continuation of a successfully implemented AIS grant-funded control project where final goals for control have not yet been met. (Success is defined as having met interim control objectives, provided deliverables on time and to the Department's satisfaction, complied with permits and their Department-approved plan).

**2 points**

**J) The degree to which the project will advance the knowledge and understanding of the prevention and control of aquatic invasive species. (1 point possible)**

- 1) Project has a robust evaluation component (surveys, 3<sup>rd</sup> party assessments) or is part of a Department-sanctioned research and demonstration project on the AIS research priority list.

**1 point**