

Scoring Sheet for Full Proposals ENV 16 CZM 05

Applicant Name: _____

Project Name: _____

Amount Requested: _____

Reviewer: _____

Total Pts: _____ (100 max) **Rank among all proposals received:** _____ (1= best) **of:** _____ (total)

Threshold Eligibility Criteria (both criteria 1) and 2) must be met to be eligible for funding)

1) Does the proposed action or strategy a) appreciably address a nutrient or pathogen related water quality or habitat issue, and b) will mitigate or restore or will likely lead to or support, actions to mitigate or restore coastal marine or inland fresh water quality or living resources impaired and adversely affected by excessive nutrients or pathogen loading?

YES _____ NO _____

2) Is the project eligible according to all other criteria identified in this solicitation?

YES _____ NO _____

If No, specify:

Note: Decisions of eligibility will be made by a majority vote of the reviewers.

Criteria	Score	Possible Points
1) Overall Project Quality, Approach, And Effectiveness in Addressing Nutrients (Nitrogen or Phosphorus Loading) or Pathogens (Bacteria)		25
2) Benefit To Ecosystem Health, Ecosystem Services, Public Health, Habitat, And Water Quality		20
3) Innovation, Sustainability, Transferability, And Strategic Benefits		15
4) Municipal Collaboration, Enhancing Municipal Capacity, Partnerships		15
5) Cost vs. Benefits		10
6) Match		10
7) Administrative Functions and Ability		5
Total		100

Reviewer Signature: _____ **Date:** _____

1) OVERALL PROJECT QUALITY, APPROACH, AND EFFECTIVENESS IN ADDRESSING NUTRIENTS (NITROGEN OR PHOSPHORUS LOADING) OR PATHOGENS (BACTERIA)

SCORE: _____ of 25 POINTS

Criteria

This scoring category evaluates to what degree, and how effective, reasonable, and clear a project is in preventing, addressing, or mitigating the effects of nutrient loading (nitrogen or phosphorus) or pathogen (bacteria) problems in the receiving coastal waters, inland fresh waters, or managing upstream sources to those receiving waters.

- ___ Project is realistic, detailed, and clear.
- ___ Proposal has clear measurable goals, outcomes, or products.
- ___ Project generates products or services, identifies end users, and identifies need or demand for the product or service.
- ___ Project is focused on preventing or addressing ecological function or water quality impaired by nutrients or pathogens (although a project may have other benefits as well).
- ___ Project results in larger watershed nutrient or pathogen reductions or has large positive impacts to affected natural resources.
- ___ Includes a concrete plan for monitoring (programmatically or water quality) and evaluating the success of the project, including estimating resource needs for monitoring and identifying funding sources if needed.
- ___ Proposal has a mechanism to determine the success of the project.
- ___ The suggested outcomes and benefits are based on sound scientific principles.
- ___ The proposed project addresses a nutrient, pathogen, or stormwater priority, is consistent with, and advances the long-term ecological goals of the Buzzards Bay Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan 2013 Update.
- ___ Site-specific projects must be located in the watershed of a DEP listed nutrient or pathogen impaired water body (see Figures 2 and 3 in Attachment D, or as justified) or provide clear evidence of the need for action.
- ___ Where applicable, project will help meet nutrient or pathogen TMDL or other plan specifically adopted for the project area to address impairment.
- ___ The project might reduce nutrients or pathogens because it is identified as an important source or contributes to a meaningful percentage of loadings.
- ___ Project is consistent with the current scientific understanding of the problem and potential solution.
- ___ Project builds upon existing knowledge base and is scalable.
- ___ Project has other outstanding qualities with respect to approach or geographic area.
- ___ Design, planning, program building, and development projects include a detailed strategy or action plan for next steps and expected tangible outcomes.
- ___ Where applicable, proposal define levels of risk, and acknowledge any possible adverse outcomes.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

2) BENEFIT TO ECOSYSTEM HEALTH, ECOSYSTEM SERVICES, PUBLIC HEALTH, HABITAT, AND WATER QUALITY

SCORE: _____ of 20 POINTS

Criteria

If the expected nutrient (nitrogen or phosphorus) or pathogen reductions are ultimately achieved as evaluated in scoring category 1, how will the ecosystem and habitats benefit? How will ecosystem services benefit? (Ecosystem services are those benefits people obtain from ecosystems such as open shellfish beds, fishing, swimming, recreational, aesthetic values, among others. See also www2.epa.gov/eco-research/ecosystems-services.) For some projects, the reviewer may need to consider long term or eventual potential outcomes.

Higher ranking proposals will meet many of these criteria:

- ___ The proposal clearly identifies the current habitat impairment or lost ecosystem services from resulting nutrient or pathogen loading and identifies a clear plan of action to address these impairments.
- ___ The proposal benefits keystone species or high value habitat and improves ecosystem health or services.
- ___ The project will likely meaningfully restore or improve ecological habitat or ecosystem health, or will improve or restore fishing, swimming, recreational or aesthetic values, or other ecological services, or reduce or mitigate impairments caused fully or partially by excess nutrients or pathogens/bacteria.
- ___ Proposal identifies or includes methods of measuring or monitoring ecological success after project completion, with clear, measurable goals, and defines approaches that can be applied after the project is complete.
- ___ Projects that address multiple stressors or have multiple beneficial outcomes will receive higher scores in this category.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

3) INNOVATION, SUSTAINABILITY, TRANSFERABILITY, AND STRATEGIC BENEFITS

SCORE: _____ of 15 POINTS TOTAL

Innovative projects may include technologies or approaches that are proven, those that need more testing, and those where there is limited knowledge and greater uncertainty. Sustainability is the likelihood that the activity will continue into the future. A project can address a problem in the context of an embayment watershed, the Buzzards Bay watershed, or have a solution to a common problem that can be transferred across many watersheds and communities across the SNEP region. Strategic planning sets the stage for future action, success, or continued action.

Criteria

- ___ Proposal develops a solution or approach to Buzzards Bay watershed nutrient or pathogen impairments that will benefit a large population, or can be applied to many embayments, other populations, or the region.
- ___ Project creates a template or model that can be shared and reused for later projects across the region.
- ___ The project or effort builds on, expands upon, and enhances an existing management framework and includes ideas or strategies that help with financial sustainability or continuing commitments.
- ___ Proposal adds to the knowledge base, develops new knowledge, evaluates, or implements innovative practices.
- ___ Project leverages resources efficiently, proposes innovative ideas that have not been tried elsewhere, or creates new financial mechanisms to support continued action.

- The project includes innovative long-term funding ideas that help reduce the need for government grant funds.
- Transfer of technology or approaches in the form of a “lessons learned” workshop or paper is a component of the proposed work.
- Phased projects build upon past effort or next phases will likely be undertaken or yield positive results.
- If applicable, the future resources needed to continue a project are articulated.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

4) MUNICIPAL COLLABORATION, ENHANCING MUNICIPAL CAPACITY, PARTNERSHIPS

SCORE: _____ of 15 POINTS TOTAL

Municipalities typically have the primary responsibility of managing water quality impairments, but often lack sufficient resources and capacity to do so. Collaboration with other municipalities or partners to pool resources can leverage more actions with equivalent funding. This scoring category evaluates both the extent of collaboration and whether that collaboration expands the capacity for municipal action in a meaningful way. If a project is solely within a municipality or local subdivision of government, and they are the applicant, and the reviewer feels that the project is not of a nature that requires collaboration, 10 points can be assigned.

Criteria

Any *eligible applicant* (see definition) may receive points under this criteria, but the proposal must be either 1) a collaboration between the applicant and a municipality or municipalities, 2) a municipal applicant collaborating with a governmental agency or non-profit entity, 3) a collaboration between multiple municipalities, 4) creates a financial mechanism or technical tool that will likely expand municipal capacity for action, or, 5) develop information or tools that can be readily be applied by municipalities. Applicants that do not meet any of these criteria will receive zero points.

Proposals that have strategic benefits for multiple municipalities will receive higher scores in this category.

Proposal where partners do not make meaningful or substantial contributions, or where the outcomes do not provide lasting benefits will receive lower points in this category.

If applicable, proposal includes tasks related to outreach to regional partners to share information about best practices and lessons learned, including outreach to regional and local partners.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

5) COST VS. BENEFITS

SCORE: _____ of 10 POINTS

This scoring category is to evaluate whether the project is likely to be a sound investment of SNEP funding, and will likely result in a positive benefit to natural resources and their use and enjoyment by the public, or will move a more complex/longer project a step closer to final completion. Reviewers are encouraged to compare project proposals between and among the overall applicant pool to determine which in their opinion provides the most benefits for each unit of cost.

Criteria

- ___ For stormwater and/or nutrient removal/remediation projects the costs appear to be within the range of similar types of projects proposed in response to this RFR or projects funded through previous grant opportunities managed by the Buzzards Bay NEP.
- ___ Projects with a larger areal extent of potential positive impacts should receive more points than project with a smaller areal extent of positive impacts.
- ___ Projects that proposed to remediate a pivotal pollutant source to an area because it is either the last remaining significant pollutant source or it is one of the largest remaining pollutant sources to an area should receive greater points assuming the costs are within the typical range and appear reasonable.
- ___ For technology research projects the application should demonstrate that the proposed technology is likely to be significantly more effective or less costly at pollutant removal than existing technologies.
- ___ For resource assessment projects the applicant should demonstrate that the knowledge gained will have a potentially very significant impact on the potential remediation strategies likely to be required.
- ___ For stormwater remediation projects, the proposal provides an estimate of acres to be opened or significantly positively impacted per dollar invested.
- ___ For nutrient removal projects, the proposal provides an estimate of pounds removed per dollar invested.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

6) MATCH

SCORE: _____ of 10 POINTS

Criteria for combined cash and in-kind

- ___ 25% to <=40% of requested funds: 1 pt
- ___ >40% to <=80% of requested funds: 3 pts
- ___ >80% to <=200% of requested funds: 7 pts
- ___ >200% to <=300% of requested funds: 9 pts
- ___ >300% of requested funds: 10 pts.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

7) ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS AND ABILITY

SCORE: _____ of 5 POINTS

Criteria

- ___ The applicant has completed projects similar in scope, duration, and required resources to the proposed effort.
- ___ The applicant demonstrates that they have, or will have, sufficient organizational ability to administer and carry out the proposed project.
- ___ Proposal includes sufficient support or partnership at the local level to fully implement the project and partner responsibilities and contributions are clearly articulated.
- ___ The scope of proposed work, timeframe, and budget are realistic, detailed, and clear.
- ___ The applicant has tasked necessary resources to undertake the proposed work and fully implement the proposed work.
- ___ The proposal outlines the full project trajectory, including identifying future funding streams.
- ___ Costs of implementation are described.
- ___ Where applicable, the applicant has identified necessary federal, state, and/or local permits and has outlined a strategy for acquiring necessary permit within the stated timeframe of the project.
- ___ The applicant has legal/jurisdictional authority to carry out the project, including permission from the property owner (required).

REVIEWER COMMENTS: