		Group Name
Eligibility Review	**Yes or No**	
Applicant Eligibility		
Eligibily entity?	**Yes or No**	
Application submitted on time?	**Yes or No**	
Project Requirements		
Is the project located in Montana within the State's jurisdictional areas? **A "Yes" means at least a portion of monitoring sites are on state waters. DEQ can not fund monitoring on non-jurisdicitional waters.**	**Yes or No**	
Does monitoring pertain to water quality?	**Yes or No**	
Is the monitoring not for profit?	**Yes or No**	
Is monitoring voluntary (i.e., is not driven by a regulatory or statutory requirement such as Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination system permit monitoring, superfund, public water supplies, Motana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) and water quality enforcement cases, other permit/application requirements, etc.)?	**Yes or No**	
Does the project support a collaborative approach?	**Yes or No**	
Will the project likely lead toward water quality improvements or protection?	**Yes or No**	
Does the project preferably incorporates one or more people monitoring in a volunteer capacity (unpaid)? **This does not require a "Yes".**	**Yes or No**	
Does the project have broader, community benefit (i.e., project objectives produce information about Montana's shared water resources and does not solely or primarily pertain to private water use such as individual wells or ditches)?	**Yes or No**	
Is the requests for funding exclusively for costs of laboratory analysis and shipping?	**Yes or No**	
Eligibility Decision (If any questions are "No" the project is denied)		
		Group Name
SAP Review - Scoring Panel	**Points**	
Revision history table present with information on changes made to the SAP? (Yes - 2; No - 0)	**2**	
Introduction includes a project overview and description of project area. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor -1)	**5**	
Monitoring goals and objectives are clearly defined, measurable, and achievable. (Excellent - 15; Good - 10; Fair - 5; Poor - 1)	**15**	
The SAP includes a list of parameters that are suitable for the objectives. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	**5**	
Outline of project team members and team members responsibilities. (Good - 3; Fair - 2, Poor -0; None -0)	**3**	
The SAP includes the list of parameters including preferred analytical method, required reporting limits, holding time, container, and preservative. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	**5**	

The SAP includes a list of monitoring sites including site name, site description, and station ID following DEQ guidance. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
The correct latitude and longitude are provided for each monitoring site. Latitude and longitude are provided in decimal degree. (All correct - 5; Most correct - 3; Less than half correct - 2; None correct - 1; None provided - 0)	5	
The monitoring locations table provides the parameters collected at each site and the rationale for site selection. (Good - 3; Fair - 2, Poor - 0; None -0)	3	
The SAP includes a clear monitoring schedule with timing and number of sampling events. A monitoring schedule should include a monitoring date, parameters, and rationale for timing. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
The SAP includes a description of the type and number of quality control samples (e.g., field duplicates, field blanks). (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
The SAP provides a monitoring order of operations. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
The SAP references SOP documentation or clearly described SOPs within the SAP or an appendix. SOP documentation must be accessible to the Technical Review Committee. (Excellent - 10; Good - 7; Fair - 5; Poor - 2)	10	
The SAP articulates how volunteers will be trained to complete monitoring. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
Appropriate level of QA/QC documentation based on project needs (i.e. field blanks, field duplicates, data quality indicators, etc.). (Excellent - 7; Good - 5; Fair - 3; Poor - 1)	7	
The SAP provides a description on how data will be managed, stored and reported. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
The SAP provides a clear description of how data will be analyzed to achieve objectives. (Excellent - 7; Good - 5; Fair - 3; Poor - 1)	7	
The field form(s) are provided in an appendix. (Yes - 2; No - 0)	2	
Does the SAP require limited grammatical and/or technical edits? (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
SAP Review Subtotal	97	0
Application Review - Scoring Panel	**Points**	
Overall Application Requirements		
The applicant is clear and concise in answer questions. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
The applicant answered all the questions without copying and pasting sections from the SAP. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
Overall, does the monitoring project aim to produce high quality, credible data intended for objective-driven data analysis (i.e., beyond solely for educational purposes)? (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
Volunteer Engagement		

Question	Points	Score
Does the monitoring project incorporate one or more persons monitoring in a volunteer capacity (unpaid)? (Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	3	
Community Benefit and Engagement		
Does the project have broader community benefit (i.e., objectives provide information to the broader community)? (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	10	
Will the results of the project be shared with the appropriate audiences? (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
Water Quality Improvement		
Will the project be used toward positive improvements or protections in water quality? (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	10	
Does the project pertain to nonpoint source pollution reductions? (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
Watershed Impact		
Does the project align with larger watershed scale planning? (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
Applicatant Ability		
Does the applicant demonstrate capacity for project administration and technical oversight (e.g., SAP development, training, monitoring, data management and submission, quality assurance review, data analysis, final reporting)? (Excellent - 10; Good - 7; Fair - 5; Poor - 2)	10	
Has the applicatant taken the appropriate steps to successfully facilitate monitoring this year? (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
Application Review Subtotal	68	• 0
Budget Review - Scoring Panel	**Points**	
Does the budget provide request funding exclusively for costs of laboratory analysis and shipping? (Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	3	
Does the budget table indicate the number of samples that will be collected for each parameter? (Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	3	
Budget Review Subtotal	6	0
Previous Participation – Program Manager (If the group has not participated previously they automatically get 20 points.)	**Points**	
The group used an appropriate amount of funding granted in previous years. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
The group provided final reports and EDDs by the deadline in previous years. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
The group's participation demonstrates the group's ability to collect high quality credible data. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
Group completes appropriate data analysis to meet monitoring objectives. (Excellent - 5; Good - 3; Fair - 2; Poor - 1)	5	
Previous Participation Subtotal	20	0
GRAND TOTAL	171	0
Funding Recommendation		
FF = Fully Fund, PF + = Partial Fund (at greater than 50%), PF – = Partial fund (at less than 50%), NF		
Reviewer Comments		

Please provide any specific thoughts regarding the proposed project. DEQ will take these comments into consideration when developing final funding recommendations. DEQ will provide these score sheets and technical review committee comments to the applicants. Thanks again for giving of your time and knowledge!