



FY2026 ON-THE-GROUND PROJECT SCORING SHEET

(To guide review team discussion)

Project Name: _____

Project Sponsor: _____

Reviewed By: _____

On-The-Ground Project Priorities – Natural Resource Specialists on the Agency Review Panel	Max Score	Points
Readiness and Need <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the project an appropriate next step for making progress towards removing a pollutant/waterbody combination from Montana’s 2020 Impaired Waters? (4 pts) Does the project include appropriate levels of landowner and partner involvement, including, where reasonable, contributions of time, money and other resources? (4 pts) Have potentially applicable permitting entities been identified and consulted? (4 pts) 	(12)	
Reducing and Preventing Nonpoint Source Pollution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project significantly reduce or prevent nonpoint source pollution? (4 pts) Are the root causes of the nonpoint source pollution problem accurately identified? (4 pts) Will the project address these root causes? (4 pts) Will the project address the most significant sources of nonpoint source pollution? (4 pts) Are nonpoint source pollution goals for the project clearly defined, measurable and attainable? (4 pts) 	(20)	
Restoring Natural Stream, Lake, and Wetland Processes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project restore natural stream, lake, and wetland processes? (15 pts) 	(15)	
Sustainable Solutions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> After initial construction and vegetation establishment (2-3 years), will natural processes provide adequate long-term maintenance? (5 pts) Will the project benefits be protected by a long-term or perpetual agreement with the landowner? (8 pts) Are project costs reasonable when compared to nonpoint source pollution reduction or prevention benefits? (5 pts) 	(18)	
On-The-Ground Review Subtotal	(70)	
Education Outreach Priorities – Natural Resource Specialists on the Agency Review Panel	Max Score	Points
Defined Goals and Measurable Outcomes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project increase local capacity to reduce nonpoint source pollution? (2 pts) Has the project sponsor provided a reasonable process for evaluating the immediate and long-term success of the education outreach effort? (2 pts) 	(4)	
Appropriate Target Audience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the target audience clearly defined? (2 pts) Is the target audience capable of taking action to reduce nonpoint source pollution? (2 pts) 	(4)	

Appropriate Method of Delivery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the EO method of delivery selected be effective to reach the target audience? (2 pts) Are the proposed EO efforts likely to promote behavior change to reduce or prevent nonpoint source pollution? (2 pts) 	(4)	
Education Outreach Review Subtotal	(12)	
Co-Benefit Considerations – DEQ Staff Review	Max Score	Points
Is the project eligible for HAB Reduction Funding?	(Y/N)	
Community Engagement <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project benefit underserved markets? (6 pts) Will the project improve or create equitable access to a clean and healthy environment? (2 pts) Did or will project planning include tribal participation and perspective? (2 pts) 	(10)	
Drought and Flood Resilience <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project improve environmental resilience for communities, native plants, wildlife, or ecosystems? (2 pts) Will the project restore or protect cool, late-season flow? (2 pts) 	(4)	
Impacts to Downstream Communities and Natural Systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project benefit downstream communities and natural systems? (2 pts) Will the project protect a drinking water source for humans? (2 pts) 	(4)	
Co-Benefit Considerations Review Subtotal	(18)	
GRAND TOTAL	(100)	
Funding Recommendation 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!		



FY2026 CAPACITY BUILDING AND EDUCATION OUTREACH SCORING SHEET

(To guide review team discussion)

Project Name: _____

Project Sponsor: _____

Reviewed By: _____

General Questions – EO Professionals on the Agency Review Panel	Max Score	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are project goals clearly defined and measurable? (5 pts) Is the proposed work an appropriate next step towards preventing or reducing nonpoint source pollution? (5 pts) Will the proposed activities achieve the project goals? (5 pts) If the project goals are achieved, will significant progress have been made towards addressing nonpoint source pollution? (10 pts) 	(25)	
Capacity Building Activities – EO Professionals on the Agency Review Panel ONLY FILL OUT THIS SECTION IF THE APPLICANT HAS INDICATED ON THEIR APPLICATION FORM THAT THEY ARE PROPOSING A CAPACITY BUILDING PROJECT.	Max Score	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the need for increased capacity clearly defined? (10 pts) Will the proposed activities produce the desired capacity? (15 pts) Is local interest and opportunity sufficient to utilize the increase in capacity? (15 pts) Is the method to measure capacity growth clearly defined and reasonable for their proposed activities? (5 pts) Will the increased capacity be sustainable over time? (5 pts) 	(50)	
Education and Outreach Activities – EO Professionals on the Agency Review Panel ONLY FILL OUT THIS SECTION IF THE APPLICANT HAS INDICATED ON THEIR APPLICATION FORM THAT THEY ARE PROPOSING AN EDUCATION AND OUTREACH PROJECT.	Max Score	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is the target behavior clearly defined and justified? (10 pts) Is the target audience clearly identified? (10 pts) Are the barriers to implementing the behavior clearly identified? (10 pts) Will the proposed activities adequately address the identified barriers and lead to behavior change? (10 pts) Is there a clearly articulated, reasonably accurate process for determining the extent of behavioral change achieved because of the project? (10 pts) 	(50)	
Cost Effectiveness and Partner Contribution – EO Professionals on the Agency Review Panel	Max Score	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the proposed project timeline and budget seem reasonable? (10 pts) Are the appropriate project partners identified and committed? (5 pts) 	(15)	
Co-Benefit Considerations– DEQ Staff Review	Max Score	Points
Community Engagement/Project Impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the project benefit underserved markets? (5 pts) Will the project's impact stretch beyond improving water quality? (flood/drought resilience, benefit a downstream community or other natural systems) (5 pts) 	(10)	

<i>Education Outreach Review Total</i>		(100)	
Funding Recommendation 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!			