

**State Marine Board - Staff Evaluation
2019-21 Boating Facility Grant Application Ranking Criteria**

Grant No.	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>	Total Score:	<input style="width:95%;" type="text" value="0"/>
Project Name:	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>	Applicant:	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>

Application Quality and Applicants Past Performance				
1	Quality of application: <i>Based on completeness, comprehensibility, supporting material, etc.</i>	Excellent	20	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Good	10	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Adequate	5	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Inadequate	0	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
2	Applicants prior grant performance: <i>Communication during all phases of past projects, management of contractor/vendor, supervision, reimbursement and timeliness</i>	Excellent	20	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Good	10	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Average	5	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Poor	0	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
3	Applicants operation and maintenance performance record: <i>Attention to user needs, site cleanliness, operational condition, condition of past funded projects, etc.)</i>	Excellent	20	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Good	10	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Average	5	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Poor	0	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>

Application Quality and Applicants Past Performance Total	0
--	----------

Project Need, Importance and User Support				
4	Serving registered boats: <i>Based on Six-Year Plan classification, Marine Patrol or other information</i>	Motorized (70-100%)	20	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Mixed (31-69%)	10	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Nonmotorized (<30%)	0	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
5	Applicant's priorities: <i>Determined by applicant. If one application is submitted it is the first priority.</i>	First	5	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Second	3	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Third	1	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		More than three	0	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
6	Priority in Six-Year Plan: <i>Is the project location in the Plan and is the amenity identified. If project is a study or master plan for an element identified use that score.</i>	High	10	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Medium	5	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Low	3	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Not Listed	0	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
7	Statewide or regional importance of waterbody: <i>Triennial Survey county waterbody use avg for two surveys or Triennial Survey site specific use and applicant reported use.</i>	High	10	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Medium	5	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Low	3	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		Not Listed	0	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
8	Lack of Similar Facility Amenity <i>Consider what side of waterbody facilities are located. Exclude facilities that you cannot access due to physical barriers such as dams or rapids. Type of boater being served by project in contrast to other facilities. Consider the waterbody/regional impact if the project was not repaired, expanded or replaced. Consider boater use density.</i>	>30	20	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		26-30 mile	15	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		21-25 mile	10	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		16-20 mile	7	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		11-15 mile	5	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
		6-10 miles	3	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>
<5	0	<input style="width:95%;" type="text"/>		

9 User group/community/political support for project: <i>Includes letters, emails, resolutions etc. Items from boating clubs such as CRYA, NW Steelheaders etc. have higher value than individual items.</i>	High Support Boater	10	
	High Support Other	7	
	Medium Support Boater	7	
	Medium Support Other	3	
	Low Support Boater	3	
	Low Support Other	1	
	No evidence	0	

Project Need, Importance and User Support Total	0
--	----------

Applicant and Other Matching Contributions and Fees
--

10 Local or State applicant matching contributions: <i>Includes all Administrative, Force Account and Cash Match</i>	>50%	30	
	45-49%	25	
	40-44%	20	
	36-40%	15	
	31-35%	10	
	26-30%	5	
	25%	1	
	<25%	0	

10 OR 11

11 Federal applicant matching contributions: <i>Includes all Administrative, Force Account and Cash Match</i>	>75%	30	
	71-75%	25	
	66-70%	20	
	61-65%	15	
	56-60%	10	
	51-55%	5	
	50%	1	
<50%	0		

12 Other non-applicant matching contributions: <i>Includes all Administrative, Force Account and Cash Match</i>	>30%	20	
	21-30%	10	
	11-20%	5	
	1-10%	1	
	<1%	0	

13 Facility use fees charged: <i>Includes: entrance fee, launch fee, parking fee, etc.</i>	Free	20	
	\$1.00-\$2.00	15	
	\$2.01-\$3.00	10	
	\$3.01-\$4.00	5	
	\$4.01-\$5.00	3	
	\$5.01 and up	0	

Applicant and Other Matching Contributions and Fees Total	0
--	----------

Design, Permitting and Suitability

14 Type of project: <i>Select up to 3 items included in the project. Do not include utilities, signage or other subparts as "other" unless it is the only part of the project.</i>	Vessel Waste Collection	11	
	Launch Ramps/Tie-up Docks	9	
	Restrooms	7	
	Parking/Access Roads	5	
	Boarding/Ski Docks	3	
	Other eligible elements	1	
	Non-eligible elements	0	

15	What issue/problem does the project resolve? <i>Select up to 2 items. Mark the primary with a "5" and secondary with a "3". You do not have to select 2.</i>	Safety		
		Reduced Maintenance Needs		
		Useful Life Extension		
		Accessibility		
		Disburse Use/Conflict Management		
16	Level of design and engineering completed: <i>If project is for master planning, hydro, cultural etc. consider the status of the statement of work, RFP etc.</i>	Ready to Bid -Final	20	
		Permit Package - Preliminary	15	
		Conceptual	5	
		None	0	
17	Project development suitability & impacts: <i>Consider design standard and environmental, cultural, land use, floodplain development</i>	Highly suitable/minor impact	20	
		Highly suitable/moderate impact	15	
		Suitable/moderate impact	10	
		Suitable/significant impact	5	
		Not suitable/extensive impact	0	
18	Status of in-water or other upland permits: <i>If project does not require COE/DSL but does require No-rise, 1200-C etc. consider how that process fits in the categories</i>	COE and DSL approved or N/A	20	
		COE or DSL approved	10	
		Application prepared and submitted	5	
		Application not prepared or submitted	0	

Design, Permitting and Suitability Total	0
---	----------

General Comments: Include your initials after comments.

	Total Points Possible	Total Points Received
Application Quality and Applicants Past Performance	60	0
Project Need, Importance and User Support	75	0
Applicant and Other Matching Contributions and Fees	70	0
Design, Permitting and Suitability	95	0
Total	300	0