

**Section 319(h) Example Score Questions**  
(Subject to Change)

**Project Title** \_\_\_\_\_

**Project Applicant** \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer/Date** \_\_\_\_\_ / \_\_\_\_\_

**1) Minimum Requirements**

a. Are the Required Items included and complete/signed?

- |  |        |                          |
|--|--------|--------------------------|
| 1 Check List of Inclusions                           | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 Project Cover Page                                 | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 Match Disclaimer                                   | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4 Application  | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5 Project Schedule                                   | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6 Watershed Based Plan or "Summary of Nine Elements" | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

b. Does applicant have Qualified Local Govt Status, if applicable? Y, N, N/A

Comments <https://apps.dca.ga.gov/LocalGovStatus/planning.asp>

c. Is this application proposing one of the following? (*select only one*)

- |  |            |                          |
|--|------------|--------------------------|
| i. Implement an existing Nine-Element Watershed-Based Plan | Y or Blank | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| ii. Implement a "Summary of Nine Elements"                 | Y or Blank | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| iii. Not implementing a Plan or Summary                    | Blank or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

d. Are each of the following included in an existing Plan or "Summary" document?

- |  |        |                          |
|--|--------|--------------------------|
| 1 Identify the pollutant sources                         | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 Estimate of load reductions expected                   | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 Describe the NPS management measures                   | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4 Estimate funding needed and document potential sources | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5 Information/education component                        | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6 Schedule for implementing management measures          | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7 Description of interim measurable milestones           | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8 Criteria to determine substantial BMP progress/success | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9 Monitoring component to evaluate effectiveness of imp. | Y or N | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

e. Is existing Plan or "Summary" doc sufficient for implementation? Y or N

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

f. Is the application committing a minimum of 40% match? Y or N

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

g. Are the project activities "above and beyond" a NPDES permit requirement? Y, N, N/A

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**2) Key Ranking Criteria**

a. Does the applicant propose activities best suited to prevent, control abate the sources of pollution?

Poor	OK	Best
0 pts.	10 pts.	20 pts.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

b. Do the budget and justification contain sufficient detail to determine how the funds will be spent?

	OK	Well
	5 pts.	10 pts.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

c. Is the project cost effective?

i. What % of budget is allocated for BMP implementation and education?  
*exclude personnel, fringe, travel, indirect costs*

	< 25%	> 25%	> 50%	> 75%
	0 pts.	10 pts.	20 pts.	50 pts.

ii. Are the line item total expenses (Fed + match) reasonable?

	High	Average or N/A	Low
A. Personnel/Fringe	0 pts.	10 pts.	20 pts.
B. Travel	0 pts.	10 pts.	20 pts.
C. Equipment	0 pts.	10 pts.	20 pts.
D. Supplies	0 pts.	10 pts.	20 pts.
E. Contractual	0 pts.	10 pts.	20 pts.
F. Other	0 pts.	10 pts.	20 pts.
G. Indirect	0 pts.	10 pts.	20 pts.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

d. Does project intend to implement aspects of 2014 GA NPS Plan?

	NPS Goals:	No	< 3	3 or >
		0 pts.	15 pts.	30 pts.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

e. Are proposed activities supported by Plan or "Summary" document?

	Weak	OK	Good
	0 pts.	15 pts.	30 pts.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

f. Are the measures of success...

i. Related to the tasks and/or deliverables? 10 pts.

ii. Quantifiable/Measurable? 10 pts.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

g. If implementing structural BMPs, does application include the following deliverables:

i. Schedule/manual for O&M or SOP? Y or N

ii. Estimates of load reductions as BMPs are installed? Y or N

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

h. If conducting Post-BMP WQ Monitoring, does application include (*either i. or ii.*):

i. Draft Targeted Monitoring Plan?

Monitoring appropriate for parameter and purpose?

Y, N or N/A


Clear methodology?

Y, N or N/A

ii. Draft Sampling Quality Assurance Plan?

Monitoring appropriate for parameter and purpose?

Y, N or N/A


Clear methodology?

Y, N or N/A

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**3) Additional Selection Priorities**

a. Does the proposal intend to...

i. address water quality in listed segment(s)?

50 pts.


ii. protect WQ via Healthy Watershed Initiative?

40 pts.

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

b. Does applicant partner with local non-profit watershed groups?

10 pts.

--

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

c. How many partners provided letters of commitment describing activities or resources they will be contributing to the project and the dollar values of their donations? *(Select only one)*

i. Six (6) or more

50 pts.


ii. Four (4) – Five (5)

40 pts.

--

iii. Two (2) – Three (3)

30 pts.

--

iv. Only one (1)

10 pts.

--

v. None

0 pts.

--

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

d. Does project propose leveraging existing water quality efforts within project area? (Up to 7 at 5 pts. each)

0 - 35 pts.

--

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

e. Does the proposal support a watershed management approach?

10 pts.

--

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

f. Does the project directly address the following...? *(Select up to four)*

i. Pathogens (ex. Fecal coliform)

25 pts.

--

ii. Sediment

25 pts.

--

iii. Nutrients (Nitrogen, Phosphorus)

25 pts.

--

iv. Low Dissolved Oxygen (excluding caused by nutrients)

25 pts.

--

v. None of the above

0 pts.

--

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

g. Are the impairments listed as the following:

i. Category 4a *(20 pts. per impairment)*

20 pts. x

--

ii. Category 5 *(15 pts. per impairment)*

15 pts. x

--

iii. Not listed, but there is documented evidence *(10 pts. per concern)*

10 pts. x

--

Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

- h. Does project propose management measures identified in RWP? 10 pts.   
 Comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- i. Will project activities achieve results beyond water quality improvements and/or protection?
- i. Environmental Justice 25 pts.
  - ii. Air Quality 25 pts.
  - iii. Water Conservation 25 pts.
  - iv. Energy Conservation 25 pts.
  - v. Stream Flow Profile 25 pts.
  - vi. Habitat Connectivity 25 pts.
  - vii. Other each x 25 pts.
- Comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- j. Does the applicant commit to match 50% or greater? 75 pts.   
 Comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- k. Will the project area be located in a priority watershed? 75 pts.   
 Comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- l. Do the project activities in the application address impervious surfaces related to causes of water quality impairment? 10 pts.   
 Comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- m. Water First Communities (*either i. or ii. or blank*):
- i. Is the applicant a Water First Community? 20 pts.
  - ii. Is the project taking place in a Water First Community that is not the applicant but an active partner? 10 pts.
- Comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- n. Does the proposal intend to help GA implement or gain approval of the Coastal NPS Program under CZARA? 50 pts.   
 Comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- o. Will the project be implemented in one of the 11 coastal counties covered under the NPS Coastal Plan? 50 pts.   
 Comments: \_\_\_\_\_
- p. Will project be implemented in a priority coastal urban cluster? 50 pts.   
 Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

**4) General Criteria**

- a. Does the application clearly and concisely describe what the project proposes to accomplish, including how and why?
- |                | Poor   | OK     | Well                         |
|----------------|--------|--------|------------------------------|
| i. Goals       | 0 pts. | 5 pts. | 10 pts. <input type="text"/> |
| ii. Background | 0 pts. | 5 pts. | 10 pts. <input type="text"/> |

iii. Activities

0 pts.

5 pts.

10 pts.

Comments:

---

b. IF APPLICABLE, has this applicant demonstrated an **inability** to properly administer and manage prior GAEPD grant-funded projects: Section 319(h), 106, 604(b), other?

Up to -200 pts.

Comments:

---

c. If the applicant has poor past performance, have they described operational changes that would improve their ability to manage a project?  
*(only add back points here if removed from item above)*

Up to +100 pts.

Comments:

---

d. How does proposal describe the watershed or jurisdictional scale of project? *(select 1)*

i. One HUC 10 or smaller watershed boundary

15 pts.

ii. Targeted watershed the size of 1 or more connected HUC 12s

10 pts.

iii. Restricted to local political or jurisdictional boundary

5 pts.

iv. Does not apply

0 pts.

Comments:

---

Subtotal Key Ranking Criteria:

Subtotal Add. Selection Priorities:

Subtotal General Criteria:

Total Score:

Overall Comments:

---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---



---