



MONTELORES COALITION STRIKE TEAM PROPOSAL RANKING MATRIX 2026

SMART	Category	Criteria	Weight	Insufficient Evidence	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent	Score
				1	2	3	4	5	
Relevancy	Alignment with Montelores Coalition's draft Outdoor Recreation and Conservation (ORC) Plan	<p>Aligned with one or more priorities in Montelores Coalition ORC Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outdoor recreation • Equitable access • Conservation • Capacity, workforce and funding • Business growth and development <p>Clarity of project locations and resource impacts</p>	20%	<p>Unclear Alignment with ORC Plan</p> <p>Project location not specified, no incorporation of current data on resource impacts</p>	<p>Weak or partial alignment with Montelores Coalition ORC plan.</p> <p>Project location not well defined.</p> <p>Limited reference to resource impact data</p>	<p>Moderate alignment with Montelores Coalition ORC Plan.</p> <p>Project location adequately defined.</p> <p>Partial reference to current resource impact data</p>	<p>Strong alignment with Montelores Coalition ORC Plan.</p> <p>Project location well defined.</p> <p>Reflects current data of potential resource impacts</p>	<p>All goals align with Montelores Coalition ORC Plan.</p> <p>Clearly delineated project area and full consideration of resource impacts</p>	
Specific	Demonstrated Purpose, Need, Impact	<p>Clearly identified the problems and articulated the value of the project (i.e. what would happen without the project moving forward).</p> <p>Evidence of community support for the project.</p> <p>Positive community impact of the project.</p>	20%	<p>No case made for need/purpose.</p> <p>No positive impacts identified; goals are vague, unclear or missing.</p> <p>No evidence of community support.</p>	<p>Weak or anecdotal rationale.</p> <p>General positive impact mentioned.</p> <p>Broad goals lacking detail.</p> <p>Little evidence of community support.</p>	<p>Some justification, limited evidence.</p> <p>Some positive impacts identified with partial data; goals are well-defined and targeted.</p> <p>Moderate evidence of community support.</p>	<p>Strong evidence and clear case for need/purpose.</p> <p>Clear evidence of positive impacts, goals are sharply defined and outcomes are tied into deliverables.</p> <p>Strong evidence of community support.</p>	<p>Strong data-driven justification showing urgency and strategic importance.</p> <p>Comprehensive positive impact analysis; goals are sharply defined and aligned with outcomes.</p> <p>Excellent evidence of community support.</p>	



SMART	Category	Criteria	Weight	Insufficient Evidence	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent	Score
Achievable	Resources, roles and responsibilities clearly defined, likelihood of success.	Resource needs and capacity defined (i.e. administration, equipment, labor, costs, etc.) Roles and responsibilities defined.	20%	Not feasible, no capacity, or resources not identified. Roles and responsibilities not defined.	Limited feasibility and/or capacity. Resource needs vague. Roles and responsibilities loosely defined.	Feasible but resource needs and/or capacity have gaps. Roles and responsibilities defined, gaps exist. Moderate likelihood of success.	Feasible with adequate capacity and well defined resource needs. Clear roles and responsibilities with few gaps. Moderately high likelihood of success.	Highly feasible, adequate capacity, well defined resource needs. Clear roles and responsibilities with no gaps and adequate capacity. High likelihood of success.	
Measurable	Clearly defined deliverables, results	Measurable deliverables clearly stated and easy to explain to stakeholders and the public. Opportunity to scale up as a pilot project for larger efforts in the future.	15%	No measurable deliverables. Inappropriate to scale up.	Measurable deliverables are vague and/or hard to explain to the public. Limited possibility to scale up.	Measurable deliverables identified but hard to explain to the public. Moderate possibility to scale up.	Measurable deliverables tied to goals. Moderately easy to explain to the public. Good possibility to scale up.	Measurable deliverables tied to goals. Easy to explain to the public. Excellent possibility to scale up.	
Achievable	Barriers and Solutions identifies	Identified barriers to project success and provides solutions.	10%	No barriers considered.	Barriers identified, no solutions.	Barriers identified, solutions vague or impractical.	Clear barriers identified, solutions are somewhat practical and attainable.	Clear barriers identified, solutions are practical and attainable.	



SMART	Category	Criteria	Weight	Insufficient Evidence	Needs Improvement	Adequate	Very Good	Excellent	Score
Time-bound	Timeline	Details providing evidence to support clearly-defined attainable goals	10%	No timeline or tasks identified.	Vague timeline or tasks. Unlikely to be achieved within the timeline.	Timeline and tasks identified. Challenging to complete project within the timeline.	Timeline and tasks identified. Probable to complete project within the timeline.	Timeline and tasks identified. Likely to complete project within the timeline.	
Relevancy	Collaborations, Partnership	Stakeholder and/or partner collaborations.	5%	No collaboration is mentioned.	Limited or vague collaboration.	Clear collaboration. No matching funds or in-kind contributions. Relationship building opportunities limited.	Clear collaboration. Matching funds or in-kind contributions possible. Relationship building opportunities are moderate.	Multiple stakeholders are collaborating. Matching funds or in-kind contributions likely. Relationship building opportunities are strong.	

SCORING

Score: Below 40%	Score: 40-59%	Score: 60-74%	Score: 75-89%	Score: 90-100%
The proposal does not align with priority goals. Several of the elements above were rated as "Insufficient Evidence". Not recommended to move forward.	Some elements were rated "Adequate" but others were rated "Needs Improvement," indicating some areas that need further development.	Elements received an "Adequate" rating; any elements with a "Needs Improvement" rating can be easily improved.	Elements received a "Very Good" rating; any elements with a "Adequate" rating can be easily improved.	Elements received an "Exceptional" rating; few if any elements need improvement.