

Watershed Restoration Projects

Grant Application Evaluation Worksheet

January 2014

Project # _____ Applicant: _____

Amount Requested from OWEB: \$ _____

THRESHOLD QUESTIONS (All answers must be “Yes” for the project to be eligible). In general, the application/project:

- Yes No Is complete enough to review
- Yes No Improves water quality, or fish or wildlife habitat
- Yes No Demonstrates sound principles of watershed management
- Yes No Uses methods adapted to the project locale
- Yes No Meets the requirements in the Oregon Aquatic Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Guide

INSTRUCTIONS. The application evaluation is divided into three sections: Project Activity Criteria, R18 Planting Activities and Budget Criteria. Information on where the answer to each question can be found is shown in parentheses. Write comments, as appropriate. Assign a score for each question within the parameters provided in the final column, with a higher score representing a better answer. When you have rated each question, add the scores for a subtotal for each section.

PROJECT ACTIVITY CRITERIA (Refer to Section III of the Restoration application for all questions below)	COMMENTS	SCORE
R1. The application adequately describes current conditions and limiting factors.		0-10
R2. The application clearly defines the (a) problem(s) and the (b) <i>root causes</i> of the problem(s).		(a) 0-10 (b) 0-10
R3. The project and each element is clearly described.		0-20
R4. The project has clearly defined, <i>measurable</i> objectives.		0-10
R5. The project designer is (a) experienced and qualified. (b) Project planning and design take into consideration extreme events and alternatives.		(a) 0-5 (b) 0-5
R6. The applicant has considered alternatives and selected the most effective and reasonable alternative.		0-10
R7. The proposed project schedule is well thought out and appears to be realistic.		0-15
R9. The project clearly addresses an OWEB restoration objective, limiting factor in a conservation plan or a conservation opportunity.		0-10

PROJECT ACTIVITY CRITERIA (continued) (Refer to Section III for all questions below)	COMMENTS	SCORE
R11. The application clearly states which restoration processes/functions will be addressed.		0-10
R12. The project connects well with other conservation work in the watershed or ecoregion and, if a continuation, builds on the experience of previous work.		0-10
R13. Completion inspection is by the appropriate entities.		0-10
R14. The project meets basic expectations for raising public awareness.		0-5
R18 PLANTING ACTIVITIES (Refer to Section I of the Planting Activities Question R18)	COMMENTS	SCORE
P1. The application clearly describes (a) the condition of the site, (b) why the particular preparation approach was chosen, and (c) any predation or competition issues.		(a) 0-20 (b) 0-10 (c) 0-10
P2. The application (a) clearly details the planting process and (b) includes specific information on all requested categories.		(a) 0-10 (b) 0-10
P3. The plant establishment plan is well thought out and realistic, and gives confidence that the planting is likely to survive and grow and achieve its goals of improving watershed function and process.		0-15
P4. Informational only and not scored individually.		0
P5. The application has (a) good standards for measuring success and (b) a well thought out plan for addressing potential low success rates.		(a) 0-5 (b) 0-5
P6. All involved parties are qualified and all necessary information is provided.		0-10
P7. If applicable, the Plant Establishment (a) shows sufficient detail and (b) unit quantities and costs appear to be reasonable, appropriate, and consistent with local market rates. Budget (Sec. II – budget page) [Note: applicants are not required to fill out the Plant Establishment Budget if they are not requesting plant establishment funds from OWEB.]		(a) 0-10 (b) 0-20
BUDGET CRITERIA	COMMENTS	SCORE
Do not evaluate the grant admin budget category. OWEB allows up to 15% grant admin costs and requires receipts or federal review of these costs.		
1. The budget (a) shows sufficient detail and (b) unit quantities and costs appear to be reasonable, appropriate, and consistent with local market rates. (Sec. IV - budget page and Sec. III #R16)		(a) 0-10 (b) 0-20

BUDGET CRITERIA (continued)	COMMENTS	SCORE
2. Personnel costs are reasonable. (Sec. IV - budget page and Sec. III #R16)		(a) 0-10 (b) 0-10
3. The project has appropriate levels of involvement and support from the right parties and partners. (Sec. II #7)		0-10
4. The applicant has sought at least 25% match (Match Form - Attachment A).		0-10
5. Based on any experience or information you may have, the applicant's past performance indicates the likelihood that the project will be completed as proposed.		0-20
TOTAL		0-355

SCORING GUIDE

If R18 (above) applies:

- 288 - 355 = High (Fund)
- 266 - 287 = Medium High (Generally a Fund)
- 245 - 265 = Medium (Possibly a Fund)
- 224 - 244 = Medium Low (Generally a No Fund)
- 0 - 223 = Low (No Fund)

If R18 does not apply:

- 185 - 230
- 173 - 185
- 159 - 172
- 145 - 158
- 0 - 144

OVERALL EVALUATION (Describe the MAIN strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, and include any recommendations for funding with conditions):
