NPS I&E Project Ranking

SCORE

1-5 Points Possible

1. Is the project targeted in a specific area?	+
 5-4- Need for the I&E campaign is identified in a local or state focused in a targeted area with the goals of reducing a sp 3-2- Campaign covers a targeted watershed, but the strategy is management plan. 1-0-Project is a random event that is not located in a targeted 	pecific pollutant. s not identified in a
2. Severity of impacts, problems, or threat	+
5-4-Project will address water quality issues that need to be as 3-2-Project needs to occur, but does not need to be done in the 1-0-No negative impacts to water quality if project does not occur.	e coming year.
3. Public health benefits	+
 5-4- I&E campaign will educate the public about what they caresulting in the reduction of contaminants that pose a risk 3-2- I&E campaign will educate the public about what they can to indirectly improve water quality, resulting improved put 1-0- Project will have little to no effect on improving or protect 	to public health. n do to change their behavior, blic health.
4. Water quality benefits	+
 5-4- I&E campaign has potential to significantly improve or addressing parameters of concern that are currently of int Quality. 3-2- I&E campaign has potential to provide some water quality address current water quality issue. 1-0-Project will provide little to no water quality benefits. 	erest to the Division of Water
5. Effectiveness of project	+
 5-4-I&E campaign has identified a specific audience, identified identified what will be done to determine the effectiveness 3-2-I&E campaign has identified a specific audience, identified identified what they will do to determine the effectiveness of 1-0-I&E campaign does not identify a specific audience or specifie be made to determine the effectiveness of the I&E campaign 	of the campaign. ed specific message, but has not of the campaign. ecific message. No effort will
6. Technical quality of proposal	+

- **5-4**-Proposal is well written, in the proper format, with adequate details about the project
- **3-2-***Proper format is used, but proposal is poorly written, with grammatical errors, and lacks details, that may require additional feedback.*
- **1-0**-Improper format is used. Grammatical errors throughout the document. It is obvious that little effort was expended in writing the proposal.

7. Cost vs. benefit (e.g. \$/number of people reached) +	
5-4-Project will reach a large audience using an economical approach.3-2-Project will reach a fair number of people, but may be fairly expensive.1-0-Project is fairly expensive and will reach a relatively small audience.	
8. Readiness to proceed +	
 5-4-Evaluations have already been done to determine who the audience is and what behaviors need to be changed to improve water quality. Funding is needed to implement a project guided by this research. 3-2-The need for an outreach campaign has been identified by partners in the state or the watershed, and a campaign is needed, but no evaluations have been conducted to identify audience or how to get the message out. 1-0-No evaluations have been completed, and the project has not been presented to partners or DWQ. 	
9. Completeness (vs. deficiencies, additional info needed) +	
 5-4-All information required in the application has been provided and applicant has done a good job outlining the deliverables of the project. 3-2-The majority of information is present, but some additional information regarding the objectives of the project may be needed. 1-0-Significant holes in the application, required information not included in the application. 	
10. Local project support/endorsement/cooperation +	
 5-4-Letters of support for the project from other partners included in the application. Ideally more than three partners will be participating in the project. 3-2-One or two other partners will assist with the project. 1-0-No partners will be associated with the project. 	
11. Matching funding acquired from other sources +	
 5-4-More funding will be provided by partners than the amount that is being requested by the applicant. 3-2-Match above the 10% requirement is provided. 1-0-Minimum 10% match, or no match will be provided for the project. 	
12. Past project performance, and grant award history (only negative if applicable)	
 -54-Applicant did not accomplish deliverables identified in application, no final report was submitted, or was submitted late. Match for project was not reported. Project was not completed in a timely manner. -32-Deliverables identified in the proposal were completed, but no final report was submitted. Extensions were required to expend funding, or funding was returned after project was unable to take place. -1-0-Project was implemented appropriately and in a timely manner, final reports were submitted 90 days after final invoice. 	

Total Score (55 possible)