

Appendix D
Scoring Sheet for Pre-proposals and Full Proposals

*This Review Committee Member scoring sheet is provided for informational purposes.
It should not be filled out or submitted by the applicant.*

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) below must be met to be eligible for funding)

1) Does the proposed project a) appreciably address a water quality or habitat issue, and b) will the proposed project mitigate or restore or likely lead to or support actions to mitigate or restore, coastal marine, or inland fresh water quality or living resources impaired?

YES _____ NO _____ (concurrence of a majority of reviewers required)

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

YES _____ NO _____ (concurrence of a majority of reviewers required)

If No, specify:

Note that the criteria listed under the six scoring categories below are provided as a guide for Review Committee Members as they develop a score for each category. Space is also provided for narrative comments that further inform the score entered.

1) OVERALL PROJECT QUALITY, APPROACH, AND EFFECTIVENESS

SCORE: _____ of 25 POINTS

Criteria

Evaluates the overall quality of the project and the description provided in the proposal.

___ Project is reasonable, realistic, detailed, and clear.

___ Proposal has clear measurable outputs (deliverables) and outcomes (expected result), which are achievable within the stated timetable.

___ Project is focused on preventing or addressing ecological function and/or water quality (although a project may have other benefits as well).

___ Proposal has a mechanism to determine the success of the project.

___ Planning and design projects include a detailed strategy or action plan for next steps and expected tangible outcomes.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

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

SCORE: _____ of 20 POINTS

Criteria

For some projects, the reviewer may need to consider long term or potential outcomes. Higher ranking proposals will meet many of these criteria:

- Project will likely meaningfully protect or restore ecosystem, habitat, and/or water quality.
- Area to be protected or restored is of high value to the overall function of the system.
- Area to be protected or restored is in serious need of the proposed intervention.
- Project will address multiple stressors or has multiple beneficial outcomes.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

3) CONSISTENCY

TOTAL SCORE: _____ of 20 POINTS TOTAL

Criteria

- The proposed project is consistent with and advances the goals of the Narragansett Bay Estuary Program Comprehensive Conservation and Management Plan 2012 Update.
- The proposed project is consistent with and advances the goals and vision of Southeast New England Program.
- Project is consistent with the current scientific understanding of the problem and potential solution.
- Project builds upon existing knowledge base and is scalable.
- Project is not redundant with other completed or ongoing efforts.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

4) COLLABORATION

TOTAL SCORE: _____ of 15 POINTS TOTAL

Collaboration with other partners to pool resources can leverage more actions with equivalent funding.

Criteria

- Applicant suitably collaborates with appropriate partners given the scope or scale of the project.
- Applicant includes collaborative strategies and plans to share results and outcomes (best practices and lessons learned, including outreach to regional and local partners).
- Project will assist in collaboration or coordination of activities in both Massachusetts and Rhode Island and/or will promote a better appreciation that the Narragansett Bay watershed is shared by both states.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

5) 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 <=100% of requested funds: 7 pts
- ≥100% to <=300% of requested funds: 10 pts

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

6) ADMINISTRATIVE CAPACITY AND FUNCTION

SCORE: _____ of 10 POINTS

Criteria

- Applicant has completed projects similar in scope, duration, and required resources to the proposed effort.
- Applicant demonstrates that they have sufficient organizational ability to administer and carry out the proposed project.
- Applicant has legal/jurisdictional authority to carry out the project, including permission from the property owner (required).
- Proposal includes sufficient support or partnership at the local level to fully implement the project and

partner responsibilities and contributions are clearly articulated.

- Scope of proposed work, timeframe, and budget are realistic, detailed, and clear.
- Applicant has tasked necessary resources to undertake the proposed work and fully implement the proposed work.
- Proposal outlines the full project trajectory, including identifying future funding.
- 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.

REVIEWER COMMENTS:

Reviewer Name: _____

Reviewer Signature: _____ **Date:** _____