



## FY2024 ROUND 2 ON-THE-GROUND PROJECT SCORING SHEET

(To guide review team discussion)

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Sponsor: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed By: \_\_\_\_\_

Bigger Picture Priorities – DEQ Staff Review	Max Score	Points
<b>Environmental Justice</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the project benefit economic or socially disadvantaged populations (e.g., minority populations, people with disabilities)? (2 pts)</li> <li>Will the project improve or create public access to a clean and healthy environment? (2 pts)</li> <li>Did or will project planning include tribal participation and perspective? (2 pts)</li> </ul>	(6)	
<b>Climate Change/Resilience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the project improve climate change resilience for communities, native plants, wildlife, or ecosystems? (2 pts)</li> <li>Will the project restore or protect cool, late-season flow? (2 pts)</li> </ul>	(4)	
<b>Impacts to Downstream Communities and Natural Systems</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the project benefit downstream communities and natural systems? (2 pts)</li> <li>Will the project protect a drinking water source for humans? (2 pts)</li> </ul>	(4)	
<b>Bigger Picture Review Subtotal</b>	<b>(14)</b>	
On-The-Ground Project Priorities – Natural Resource Specialists on the Agency Review Panel	Max Score	Points
<b>Reducing and Preventing Nonpoint Source Pollution</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the project <u>significantly</u> reduce or prevent nonpoint source pollution? (5 pts)</li> <li>Are the root causes of the nonpoint source pollution problem accurately identified? (5 pts)</li> <li>Will the project address these root causes? (5 pts)</li> <li>Will the project address the most significant sources of nonpoint source pollution? (3 pts)</li> <li>Are nonpoint source pollution goals for the project clearly defined, measurable and attainable? (5 pts)</li> </ul>	(23)	
<b>Restoring and Protecting Natural Stream, Lake, and Wetland Processes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the project maintain natural stream, lake, and wetland processes? (10 pts)</li> <li>Will the project restore natural stream, lake, and wetland processes? (10 pts)</li> </ul>	(20)	
<b>Sustainable Solutions</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After initial construction and vegetation establishment (2-3 years), will natural processes provide adequate long-term maintenance? (5 pts)</li> <li>Will the project benefits be protected by a long-term or perpetual agreement with the landowner? (5 pts)</li> <li>Are project costs reasonable when compared to nonpoint source pollution reduction or prevention benefits? (5 pts)</li> </ul>	(15)	

<b>Readiness and Need</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the project an appropriate next step either for making progress towards removing a pollutant/waterbody combination from Montana’s 2020 Impaired Waters list or preventing a healthy waterbody from becoming impaired? (5 pts)</li> <li>Does the project include appropriate levels of landowner and partner involvement, including, where reasonable, contributions of time, money and other resources? (5 pts)</li> <li>Have potentially applicable permitting entities been identified and consulted? (5 pts)</li> </ul>	(15)	
<b>On-The-Ground Project Review Subtotal</b>	<b>(73)</b>	
<b>Education Outreach Priorities – EO Professionals on the Agency Review Panel</b>	<b>Max Score</b>	<b>Points</b>
<b>Defined Goals and Measurable Outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the project increase local capacity to reduce nonpoint source pollution? (2 pts)</li> <li>Has the project sponsor provided a reasonable process for evaluating the immediate and long-term success of the education outreach effort? (2 pts)</li> </ul>	(4)	
<b>Appropriate Target Audience</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the target audience clearly defined? (2 pts)</li> <li>Is the target audience capable of taking action to reduce nonpoint source pollution? (2 pts)</li> </ul>	(4)	
<b>Appropriate Method of Delivery (activity)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the EO efforts reach the target audience? (2 pts)</li> <li>Are the proposed EO efforts likely to motivate the target audience to take actions to reduce or prevent nonpoint source pollution? (3 pts)</li> </ul>	(5)	
<b>Education Outreach Review Subtotal</b>	<b>(13)</b>	
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>(100)</b>	
<b>Funding Recommendation</b> FF = Fully Fund, PF + = Partial Fund (at greater than 50%), PF – = Partial fund (at less than 50%), NF = Not Fund		
<b>Reviewer Comments</b> Please provide any specific thoughts regarding the proposed project, including any specific task and budget recommendations. DEQ staff will take these comments into consideration when developing final funding recommendations to send to EPA. DEQ may also share your comments, in whole or in part, with project sponsors and the public. Thanks again for giving of your time and knowledge!		



## FY2024 ROUND 2 CAPACITY BUILDING AND EDUCATION OUTREACH SCORING SHEET

(To guide review team discussion)

Project Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Project Sponsor: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewed By: \_\_\_\_\_

Capacity Building – DEQ Staff and EO Professionals on Agency Review Panel	Max Score	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the proposed work an appropriate next step for protection or improvement of water quality in the region? (5 pts)</li> <li>Are the outcomes for the project clearly defined, measurable and attainable? (5 pts)</li> </ul>	(10)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will the project help the organization's capacity to reduce nonpoint source pollution? (10 pts)</li> </ul>	(10)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are stakeholders defined and is their role reasonable to help the organization reach the next step to protect water quality? (5 pts)</li> <li>Is the anticipated timeline reasonable? (2 pts)</li> <li>Does the project incorporate environmental justice efforts and priorities? (3 pts)</li> </ul>	(10)	
<b>On-The-Ground Project Review Total</b>	<b>(30)</b>	
Education Outreach Projects – EO Professionals on the Agency Review Panel	Max Score	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is there a defined nonpoint source pollution issue? Will the project increase local capacity to reduce and prevent nonpoint source pollution? (8 pts)</li> <li>Has the project sponsor provided a reasonable process for evaluating the immediate and long-term success of the education outreach effort? (5 pts)</li> </ul>	(13)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are the proposed EO efforts likely to motivate the target audience to take actions to reduce or prevent nonpoint source pollution? (8 pts)</li> <li>Is the target audience defined and capable of taking action to reduce or prevent nonpoint source pollution from the delivery method chosen? (5 pts)</li> </ul>	(13)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is the anticipated timeline reasonable? (2 pts)</li> <li>Does the project incorporate environmental justice efforts and priorities? (2 pts)</li> </ul>	(4)	
<b>Education Outreach Review Total</b>	<b>(30)</b>	
<b>Funding Recommendation</b> FF = Fully Fund, PF + = Partial Fund (at greater than 50%), PF – = Partial fund (at less than 50%), NF = Not Fund		

**Reviewer Comments**

Please provide any specific thoughts regarding the proposed project, including any specific task and budget recommendations. DEQ staff will take these comments into consideration when developing final funding recommendations to send to EPA. DEQ may also share your comments, in whole or in part, with project sponsors and the public. Thanks again for giving of your time and knowledge!