

COST SHARE GRANT REVIEW

Purpose

This document provides information on how funding decisions are made for cost share grant applications.

Cost Share Grant Review

This is a summary of who reviews cost share applications and the process of review and funding.

- 1) The grant review panel receives applications from staff that arrive on time and that meet the criteria of the grant program. There are two review panels:
 - a) Staff and Board of Managers members review government, association, business, and nonprofit applications.
 - b) Staff and Citizen Advisory Committee members review residential applications.
- 2) Review panel members give each application a numerical score by completing a Cost Share Grant Scoring Form for each application.
- 3) The group review panels meet, and funding recommendations are made using the numerical scores of the grants and group discussion. Funding recommendations go to the Board of Managers.
- 4) The Board of Managers votes on the funding recommendations.

Applications that do not comply with all cost share program requirements, including applications that are late, incomplete or missing application components will not be considered for funding.

Cost Share Grant Scoring Form

The Cost Share Grant Scoring Form is how a cost share application is numerically scored. It is based on three sections: eligibility pre-screening, project quality part 1, and project quality part 2. Instructions included on this form are for grant reviewers. **No action on this form is required by grant applicants.** It is for information purposes only.

Eligibility Pre-Screening

Is the project located within the NMCWD?	Yes/No
Are all the application questions completed?	Yes/No
Are all project forms included?	Yes/No
Are all project forms completed?	Yes/No

If any of the above questions answered No, stop evaluation here.

Project Quality Part 1

Instructions for reviewer: Rate all questions on a 0-2 scale and calculate average score in table.

How satisfactory is the level of detail in the project application?				
very <u>un</u> satisfactory	0	1	2	very satisfactory
How well does the project utilize	or build	l partne	rships?	
<u>not</u> well	0	1	2	very well
How visible is the project to the pothers?	ublic <i>or</i>	how sa	ntisfacto	ory are the plans to share the project with
low visibility or unsatisfactory	0	1	2	high visibility or satisfactory
How good is the applicant's plan the project?	to info	rm oth	ers abo	ut the environmental benefits of
not good	0	1	2	very good
How reasonable is the timeline ar	nd budg	et for tl	he prop	osed work?
very <u>un</u> reasonable	0	1	2	very reasonable
How satisfactory is the applicant's understanding of, and willingness to undertake, maintenance?				
very <u>un</u> satisfactory	0	1	2	very satisfactory
Average score for Part 1 (total of assigned points/6)/6 =				

Project Quality Part 2

Instructions: Complete the correct table for the applicable project type and calculate the average score.

Shoreline Buffer

Project Type	Answer / Point value		Point Value Assigned
Does the project buffer a wetland, lake, or Nine Mile Creek?	No / 0 points Yes / 1 point		
Average Buffer Width (outward from water) for <u>residential</u> <u>projects</u>	0-4.9 feet / 0 points 5-9.9 feet / 1 point 10-16.4 feet / 2 points 16.5+ feet / 3 points	score only	
Average Buffer Width (outward from water) for other projects (association, nonprofit, business, city)	0-16.4 feet / 0 points 16.5-29.9 feet / 1 point 30-49.9 feet / 2 points 50+ feet / 3 points	one type	
Average	/2 =		

Raingarden

Question	Answer / Point value	Point Value Assigned
Does the project capture water that would otherwise drain to a water resource via overland flow or a storm drain?	No / 0 points Yes / 1 point	
What is the source of runoff water?	Roof and/or green space / 0 points Roof or green space <u>and</u> impervious surfaces / 1 Impervious surfaces only / 2	
What amount of water is the raingarden capturing (24-hour rain event)?	>0-0.33 inch/ 0 points 0.34-0.66 inches / 1 point 0.67-0.99 inches / 2 points 1+ inches / 3 points	
Avera	/3 =	

Chloride Reduction

Criteria	Answer / Point Value	Point Value Assigned
Anticipated % decrease of	0-5% / points	
chloride	>5-10% / 1 point	
	>10% / 2 points	
What % of the chloride reduction	0-10% / 0 points	
will be in NMCWD?	11-50% / 1 point	
	51-100% / 2 points	
Average score for table (sum of assigned points/2)		/2 =

Restoration

Question	Answer / Point value	Point Value Assigned
What is the percent property area restored?	0-5% / 0 points 6-20% / 1 point 21-34% / 2 points 35%+ / 3 points	
Residential Projects: What is the size of the restoration?	0-0.02 acres / 0 points >0.02-0.5 acres / 1 point 0.5-1 acres / 2 points 1+ acres / 3 points score only	
All Other Projects (association, nonprofit, business, city): What is the size of the restoration?	0-0.1 acres / 0 points 0.11-1 acres / 1 point 1-3 acres / 2 points 3+ acres / 3 points	
Is the applicant planning to plant the entire area of disturbance with native vegetation?	No / 0 points Yes / 1 point	
Is the project's property adjacent to a water body (any type)?	No / 0 points Yes / 1 point	
Average sco	/4 =	

Pervious Pavers/Pavement

Question	Answer / Point Value	Point Value Assigned	
What size rainfall runoff will the practice reduce from the property (24-hour rain event)?	>0-0.33 inch/ 0 points 0.34-0.66 inches / 1 point 0.67-0.99 inches / 2 points 1+ inches / 3 points		
What is the source of runoff water?	Roof and/or green space / 0 points Roof or green space <u>and</u> impervious surfaces / 1 Impervious surfaces only / 2		
Does the project capture water that would otherwise drain to a water resource via overland flow or a storm drain?	No / 0 points Yes / 1 point		
Average score for table (sum of assigned points/3)/3 =			

Score Summary

Section	Section Point Subtotal
Project Quality Part 1 (Average score)	
Project Quality Part 2 (Average score)	
	Total: