

STATEWIDE EDUCATION AND OUTREACH GRANT RANK CRITERIA

319 Project selections and budget allocations for each project category are made by utilizing rank and review results, rank and review comments, NPS Program priorities, and budget considerations. Each project has standard criterion, section 1-8 (excluding section 5) to meet and additional criteria by project type in Section 5. Total points are compiled for each project and are used to make preliminary award selections for programmatic projects and implementation projects in separately.

Applications must meet the following criteria to be scored by 319 Grant review team:

- The project contributes to implementation of the Kentucky Nonpoint Source Management Program to protect surface water or groundwater.
- Application includes required 40% match.
- Project can be completed within a maximum of a 3-year window
- Proposals meeting these criteria will be reviewed and evaluated on the criteria listed below, with a possible total score of **91** points.

	Analized Item	Maximum Possible Points
	1. Project Features and Location	319 Grant Report attached
Affected HUC 12s identified		2
Majority of identified HUCs assessed		1
HUCs have NPS monitoring data of some kind		1
DOW Priority Watershed		2
Basin Team Priority Watershed		2
Includes Healthy Watershed		1
Includes Aquatic Habitat Priority Watershed		1
Source Water Protection Area		1
Includes Special Use Waters (OSRW, Wild Rivers, etc.)		1
Approved TMDL or TMDL alternative		1
Identifies, constructs or includes wetlands		1
Includes reservoirs/lakes		1
Addresses hazard mitigation		1
	Total:	18

2. Project Background	Analyzed Item	Maximum Possible Points
	Describes reason for concern or protection	2
	Project clearly connects to NPS Abatement	3
	Narrative summarizes goals, objectives, and activities (GOA)	2
	Project contributes to NPS 5-year Management Plan	2
	Total:	9

3. Plan of Work and Measurable Impacts	Analyzed Item	Maximum Possible Points
	GOA are clear and concise	3
	Goals and activities would result in a completed project	2
	Plan of Work is based on GOA	2
	Outcomes and deliverables are specific and measurable	2
	Outcomes and deliverables would impact beyond project timeframe	2
Total:	11	

4. Task and Timelines	Analyzed Item	Maximum Possible Points
	Project has identified detailed milestones and timelines	3
	Timelines are reasonable	3
	Milestones are based off of GOA	2
	Max of 3 years	2
Total:	10	

5A. Education & Outreach Program Criteria	Analyzed Item	Maximum Possible Points
	Project identifies an NPS education gap	2
	Project addresses filling the education gap	2
	Implements pre-/post-surveys	2
	Educational activities aimed at behavior change	2
Total:	8	

6. Budget	Analyzed Item	Maximum Possible Points
	Budget tables are accurate and complete	2
	Provides detailed budget narrative	3
	Demonstrates 40% match	2
	Match source is appropriate	2
	Project costs are reasonable	2
	Budget allocations per category are reasonable for project scale and type	2
	Total:	13

7. Partnership and Capability	Analyzed Item	Maximum Possible Points
	Project lead and key staff identified	2
	Lead and staff with sufficient grant management experience	3
	Letters of support included	2
	Has stakeholder support	2
	Involves appropriate partners	2
	Partners and roles identified	2
	Project plans to use other funds in project area	1
Total:	14	

8. Community Engagement, Outreach, and Education	Analyzed Item	Maximum Possible Points
	Target audience identified	2
	Education and outreach component increases environmental literacy	2
	Project has sufficient E&O events planned to encourage behavior change	2
	If applicable, applicant considered potential negative impacts the project may have on the community	2
	Total:	8
Point Grant Total:	91	