

Supplemental 12 Application Questions

Scope of Work

- Increases in points by 50 points (200-250)

Budget

- Increased in points by 75 points (75-150)
- Now includes cost benefit elements on Task Cost General form that were previously in Severity of the Problem and Technical Planning questions.

Severity of the WQ Problem

- Now called Water Body and Water Quality Health Improvement form
- Decreased by 50 points (300-250)
- Cost effectiveness moved to Budget
- Additional points (100) available for Coordination of Federal and State Priorities (Previously Technical Planning)

Project Team

- Remains at 50 Points
- Additional points available in Project Development, Local Support and Past Performance

Technical Planning

- Not a standalone form
- Points have been distributed among Coordination of Federal and State Priorities and Water Body and Water Quality Health Improvement, and Project Development, Past Performance and Local Support

Local Commitment

- Not a standalone form
- Integrated in to Project Development, Local Support, and Past Performance

Readiness to Proceed

- Points Reduced by 50 Points (125-75)

New Application Forms Summary

Form and Scoring	Points
<p>Scope of Work Form (up to 250 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The scope of work represents a complete and concise description of the project tasks and outcomes, including deliverables and timelines. The project directly and measurably addresses a water quality problem. 	<p>0-100</p> <p>0-150</p>
<p>Task Costs General Form (up to 150 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The cost estimate process is reasonable. The project task costs represents a good value for the work and water quality benefits achieved. The applicant has identified adequate matching funds. 	<p>0-50</p> <p>0-100</p>
<p>Water Quality and Public Health Improvement Form (up to 250 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How severe is the water quality problem and how well is it defined? The project will achieve substantial water quality and public health benefits. Project success can be measured, and the proposed methods to measure success are reasonable. The project will provide long-term water quality benefits. Systems are in place to sustain the benefits after funding support has ended. 	<p>0-50</p> <p>0-100</p> <p>0-50</p> <p>0-50</p>
<p>Coordination with State and Federal Priorities Form (up to 100 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How well does the project address a current permit requirement or TMDL implementation? OR How well does the project address other state or federal water quality requirements? OR How well does the project address the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda or current approved plan or program, other than a TMDL, specifically designed to address water quality problems? AND How well does the applicant and the project address greenhouse gas emission reductions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070? 	<p>0-100</p>
<p>Project Team Form (up to 50 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Team members' roles and responsibilities are well defined and adequate for the Scope of Work. Team members' past experience is relevant. Staffing commitment is well documented. 	<p>0-20</p> <p>0-20</p> <p>0-10</p>
<p>Project Development, Local Support, and Past Performance Form (up to 75 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A comprehensive decision making process was used to arrive at the proposed project. Plans for long-term project success and sustainability were considered during project development. A high level of local support and commitment for the project is documented. The applicant documents successful performance on other funded water quality projects, including Ecology funded projects. 	<p>0-20</p> <p>0-20</p> <p>0-20</p> <p>0-15</p>
<p>Readiness to Proceed Form (up to 75 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project elements are in place for the project to proceed and documentation is provided. 	<p>0-75</p>
<p>Financial Hardship Form (0 or 50 points)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does the applicant meet the criteria for financial hardship? 	<p>0 or 50</p>

Stormwater activity project

Check all the type(s) of project that apply: Source control activities, mapping stormwater system, public education and outreach, Stormwater monitoring, Stormwater management planning, Watershed/basin evaluation and characterization, Development of a stormwater utility and/or ordinance, Other activity project not related to design and/or construction of a stormwater facility, please describe (char 200)

Is this stormwater project required under a permit? If yes, provide the permit number.

Stormwater facility project

Check all the type(s) of project that apply: Retrofit an existing stormwater facility, Install accepted low-impact development (LID) techniques, Retrofit project with LID components, New or retrofit construction of vector waste facility, Installation of pre-treatment/oil control facilities upstream of existing drywells, Stormwater quality treatment and flow control to reduce stormwater flows to combined sewers, Installation of TAPE-approved General Use Level Designation treatment technologies, Other (specify) (char 100)

Upload all prerequisite planning documents:

Stormwater Facility Planning and Design-Complete the Stormwater Project Analysis form

Stormwater Facility Construction-Submit the plans and specifications with the application, SERP concurrence is required for stormwater construction projects, Submit the concurrence letter with the application (upload documents below)

Stormwater Facility Design and Construction- Complete the Stormwater Project Analysis Form before submitting this application

Stormwater Facility Project Analysis (For Stormwater Facility projects with planning and design elements only)

Provide information on the designer and their qualifications including professional licenses, experience, and relationship with the applicant. Include contact information for the designer. Designer Name (char 200), Qualifications (char 1000), Contact Information (char 200)

Provide a project description that includes a location map and a topographical map of the drainage area overlain with project elements (buildings, swales, erosion control, structures, etc.) (char 2500)

Upload documents (Maps of project)

Provide the characteristics of the stormwater, including pollutant load and the land use in the area where the flow originates. (char 2500)

Provide the design water quality and flow control flow rates for the project and a discussion of why the proposal flows are appropriate. (char 2500)

If the project is a retrofit, provide discussion of how the proposed level of water quality treatment and flow control compare with the new and redevelopment standards. (char 2500)

If applicable, provide a discussion of the alternative projects evaluated and the reasons they are unacceptable. (char 2500)

Provide the basic design data for the project proposal. (char 2500)

If applicable, provide an estimate of the cost of the proposed project compared to the alternatives considered. (char 2500)

For infiltration sites, provide a discussion of the site suitability for the proposed project. (char 2500)

- Include soil suitability to the site and depth to ground water if known

- Include site characteristics that would likely yield a suitable site

- Include the plan for further investigation that will be carried out in the design phase

Original Question/Guidance	EAGL Integrated Program Question	Guidance to Reviewers
<p>Scope of Work 200 Pts.</p> <p>Scoring Guide Complete and concise project description. Provides clear detailed description of project tasks, deliverables, timelines and purpose. – Up to 200 Points</p> <p>Reviewers award points for a clear, complete, and well thought-out scope that directly addresses a stormwater problem. The scope demonstrates an understanding of the work required to fully implement and complete the project.</p> <p>Using the task and required performance framework provided below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a detailed scope of work for the project that includes clearly defined tasks, deliverable, timelines and cost per task • Describe the project area and provide supporting maps(s) and any relevant diagrams and/or pictures. • Reference the stormwater manual used for the project design. 	<p>EAGL Form Scope of Work</p> <p>Task Title (char 50) Task Cost Task Description (char 3000) Task Goal Statement (char 1000) Task Expected Outcomes (char 1000) Recipient Task Coordinator Deliverables (Description (char 300), if applicable (Due Date, EIM Study ID, Latitude/Longitude, Location Address (char 200)</p> <p>Scope of Work Form 250 Pts This form is worth up to 250 total points as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 0-100 points: The Scope of Work represents a complete and concise description of the project tasks and outcomes, including deliverables and timelines. • 0-150 points: The project directly and measurably addresses a water quality problem. <p>Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluators award points for a clear, complete, and well thought-out scope that directly addresses a water quality problem. The scope must demonstrate an understanding of the work required to implement and complete the project. • For projects that implement BMPs on private property, evaluators will factor the status of landowner commitments to implement BMPs into the score. Applicants must provide detailed maps for each subject property showing BMP locations and a detailed list of BMPs to be implemented on each property including length of exclusion fencing, feet of stream buffers, acres of restoration, or other applicable numerical information about the BMPs. 	<p>Guidance to Reviewers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good answer will fully describe <u>how</u> the applicant will achieve the WQ improvement from question 3. • Look for deliverables with clear numeric commitments (# of animals fenced, # of miles of stream restored, population served). • The application question specifically asks for maps and locations of work. Do not assign full points without a map and specifics on the location of the project work. • Land owner commitment is critical for non point BMP projects. • Scoring should reflect fatal flaws in the Scope. • Check that attachments are present, and that they are consistent with the application. • For Stormwater projects, the applicant must reference the manual used for the project design. Do not award full points without that reference. • The applicant may refer to Facility Plans or TMDLs. They do not have to repeat work they have done before.

Original Question/Guidance	EAGL Integrated Program Question	Guidance to Reviewers								
<p>Budget 75 Pts.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="96 298 1090 651"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="96 298 801 379">Scoring Guide</th> <th data-bbox="801 298 1090 379">Total 75 Points</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="96 379 801 469">Complete project budget is consistent with the scope of work.</td> <td data-bbox="801 379 1090 469">Up to 25 pts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="96 469 801 516">The cost estimates are clear and reasonable.</td> <td data-bbox="801 469 1090 516">Up to 25 pts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="96 516 801 651">The project budget represents a good value for the work and water quality benefit achieved. A value analysis or similar study was performed.</td> <td data-bbox="801 516 1090 651">Up to 25 pts.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Budget: Points are awarded for a complete, reasonable budget that is consistent with the tasks described in the scope of work. <i>Please fill out the Budget by Task and by Object.</i></p> <p>Clearly define the Task-oriented budget.</p> <p>Cost Estimate Process Reviewers award points to cost-effective projects with accurate cost estimates. For example, an applicant may determine cost effectiveness and estimate accuracy based on experience with past or on-going projects, through consultation with other entities that have related experience, or through a planning process such as value analysis.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how costs were estimated. Include the steps taken to ensure accuracy. Describe the process used to control cost and ensure that this is a cost effective project(e.g. value engineering or cost benefit analysis Identify match sources. 	Scoring Guide	Total 75 Points	Complete project budget is consistent with the scope of work.	Up to 25 pts.	The cost estimates are clear and reasonable.	Up to 25 pts.	The project budget represents a good value for the work and water quality benefit achieved. A value analysis or similar study was performed.	Up to 25 pts.	<p>EAGL Form</p> <p>Task Cost General Questions Describe and provide calculations on how task costs were estimated. Explain how you calculated each task cost and why it is necessary for the project. Include steps taken to ensure the accuracy of cost estimates. (Char 2,000)</p> <p>Describe the process used to control costs and ensure that this is a cost-effective project (e.g., value engineering for facilities projects, cost analysis for activities projects). Show the relationship between the cost of the project and the water quality benefit achieved. (Char 2,000)</p> <p>Upload Documents</p> <p>Task Cost is included with the Scope of Work</p> <p>Funding Guidelines</p> <p>Scoring This form is worth up to 150 total points as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 50 points: The cost estimate process is reasonable. Up to 100 points: The project budget represents a good value for the work and water quality benefits achieved. For nonpoint source activity projects requesting grant funding, the applicant identifies adequate matching funds. <p>Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators award points for a complete, reasonable budget that is consistent with the tasks described in the Scope of Work. Evaluators award points for projects with accurate cost estimates. Estimate accuracy may be judged based on experience with past or ongoing projects, through consultation with other entities that have related experience, or through a planning process such as value analysis. Evaluators award points for cost-effective projects that represent a good investment of public funds to achieve water quality benefits. Nonpoint activity projects implementing BMPs must provide a detailed cost estimate for each BMP proposed for installation, as detailed in the Scope of Work. Construction projects must attach a detailed cost estimate for construction and engineering services. Applicants for all other projects should submit a cost estimate sufficient to justify the costs associated with each task. 	<p>Guidance to Reviewers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Award points for a budget that is consistent with the scope of work. Look for details in the applicant’s cost estimating process. Simply answering "Based on past experience" gets a low score. Describing that experience and how it was used for this estimate gets a better score. Look for supporting documents (engineer’s cost estimate, etc.) Value Engineering may earn points here if used intelligently. Award points for ‘good value’ based on the <i>type</i> of project. For example, consider whether the project is a good value for a <i>design</i> project, or good value for a <i>sampling</i> project.
Scoring Guide	Total 75 Points									
Complete project budget is consistent with the scope of work.	Up to 25 pts.									
The cost estimates are clear and reasonable.	Up to 25 pts.									
The project budget represents a good value for the work and water quality benefit achieved. A value analysis or similar study was performed.	Up to 25 pts.									

Original Question/Guidance	EAGL Integrated Program Question	Guidance to Reviewers																		
<p>Severity of Stormwater Problem</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="77 298 1041 876"> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="77 298 1041 379">Scoring Guide 300 Points</td> <td data-bbox="777 298 1041 379" style="text-align: right;">Total 300</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="77 379 777 479">Points</td> <td colspan="2"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="77 479 777 580">Severity of the stormwater quality and/or hydrologic problem is well documented.</td> <td data-bbox="777 479 1041 580" style="text-align: center;">Up to 100 pts.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="77 580 777 681">The extent to which the project will achieve substantial water quality or hydrologic benefits that directly address the identified problem in the area of interest.</td> <td data-bbox="777 580 1041 681" style="text-align: center;">Up to 50 pts.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="77 681 777 782">The project provides treatment for a large area, or addresses a significant portion of the area affected by the stormwater problem described above.</td> <td data-bbox="777 681 1041 782" style="text-align: center;">Up to 50 pts.</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="77 782 777 876">The applicant has planned for the long term sustainability of the project's water quality benefits.</td> <td data-bbox="777 782 1041 876" style="text-align: center;">Up to 100 pts.</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Scoring Guide 300 Points		Total 300	Points			Severity of the stormwater quality and/or hydrologic problem is well documented.	Up to 100 pts.		The extent to which the project will achieve substantial water quality or hydrologic benefits that directly address the identified problem in the area of interest.	Up to 50 pts.		The project provides treatment for a large area, or addresses a significant portion of the area affected by the stormwater problem described above.	Up to 50 pts.		The applicant has planned for the long term sustainability of the project's water quality benefits.	Up to 100 pts.		<p>EAGL Form</p> <p>Water Body and Water Quality Needs Addressed Identify water bodies the project target's, (ie, freshwater rivers, freshwater lakes, freshwater wetlands, groundwater, direct marine water, saltwater estuary)</p> <p>Identify all the resource protection and regulatory requirements that this project addresses (ie, Endangered or threatened salmonids, other endangered species act species, protection of shellfish habitat, NPDES permit requirements, state waste discharge permit) Identify all the water quality parameters that this project targets (ie, dissolved oxygen, sediment, nitrogen, fecal coliform, phosphorus, temperature, pH) Identify the water bodies, any impairments (Category 4A, 4B, and 5 waters), and listing parameters that your project will address (See http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/303d/currentassessmt.html) Does the project address TMDL (y/n). If yes, list them.</p> <p>Guidance</p> <p>Scoring This form is worth up to 250 total points as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Up to 50 points: How severe is the water quality problem and how well is it defined? • Up to 100 points: The project will achieve substantial water quality and public health benefits. • Up to 50 points: Project success can be measured, and the proposed methods to measure success are reasonable. • Up to 50 points: The project will provide long-term water quality benefits. Systems are in place to sustain the benefits after funding support has ended. <p>Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluators award points for improvements and protection of water quality and public health. Projects that provide substantial environmental and public health improvements receive the most points. Projects that provide measurable improvements receive more points than those with unclear or vague benefits. • Evaluators consider only the actual benefit, total impact (area impacted, number of people affected, resource affected), level of implementation, and the severity of the problem. • Evaluators consider only changes that can be achieved by the proposed Scope of Work. • A minimum score of 125 points on this form is required to obtain funding. • Ecology uses the score on this form as the primary tie-breaker for overall points. If two projects have the same overall score, Ecology will place the project that scores higher on this form above the other on the priority list. In cases where both applicants receive the same score on this form, Ecology will use the score from the Readiness to Proceed Form as the secondary tie-breaker. <p>Coordination with State and Federal Priorities (Refinance projects do not have to fill this portion out) (Scored) Describe how this project is specifically required by a state or federal agency. Provide reference or documentation including permit conditions, Ecology orders, court orders, or other correspondence.</p> <p>OR Describe how this project implements specific actions in a TMDL Water Quality Improvement Report, Water Quality Implementation plan, or Watershed-Based Plan that includes the Environmental Protection Agency's "Nine Minimum Elements". See Section I of http://water.epa.gov/polwaste/nps/upload/watershed_mgmnt_quick_guide.pdf. (char 2500) If applicable, provide the name of the Ecology TMDL Lead or Stormwater permit manager and the last date of contact. (char 1000)</p> <p>If in the Puget Sound basin (WRIAs 1-19), describe how the project meets the goals of the Puget Sound Partnership Action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A good answer will fully explain "Why" the applicant is doing this specific project. • Consider how much of the water quality improvement is related to the project scope of work. • Supporting data should reflect measurable improvements (e.g. #of failing OSS fixed, increased fecal counts, beach closures). Documentation and data need to be provided for supporting the statement. • Human Health benefits rate equally with Water Quality benefits. • Rate planning and design projects based on the ultimate benefits from a completed project for question 3.
Scoring Guide 300 Points		Total 300																		
Points																				
Severity of the stormwater quality and/or hydrologic problem is well documented.	Up to 100 pts.																			
The extent to which the project will achieve substantial water quality or hydrologic benefits that directly address the identified problem in the area of interest.	Up to 50 pts.																			
The project provides treatment for a large area, or addresses a significant portion of the area affected by the stormwater problem described above.	Up to 50 pts.																			
The applicant has planned for the long term sustainability of the project's water quality benefits.	Up to 100 pts.																			
<p>Reviewers award points for addressing severe stormwater issues, documentation of those problems, and expected protection of water quality and improvements to hydrologic function. Projects with measurable improvements to the identified problem receive more points than those with unclear or vague benefits.</p>																				
<p>Reviewers will consider the actual benefit, the total impact (area impacted, number of people affected) and level of implementation, and the severity of the stormwater issues. Reviewers will consider only changes that can be achieved by the proposed scope of work. Define the severity of the stormwater problem. If available, show how the problem has been documented in a plan or assessment (e.g., TMDL Water Quality Improvement Report or Water Quality Implementation Plan, presence of 303(d)-Listed water bodies, stormwater basin plan, watershed assessment, part of a watershed or salmon recovery plan, or other related plan).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Describe the expected environmental outcomes of the project, including how the project will directly address the identified stormwater problem, achieve water quality protection or improvements, and improve or restore the hydrologic functions of the watershed. For example, how will the final project address the problem described above? <input type="checkbox"/> Provide information on the treatment and the size of area being treated. Describe how much of the stormwater issue will be addressed by the project. Describe how much of the watershed will be affected by this project. Describe how the proportion of the project basin compares to the basin upstream of the project: Reviewers will award points as follows: 1-20 pts 0 - 40% of the upstream basin 																				

21-30 pts` 41-60% of the upstream basin
 31-40 pts 61-80% of the upstream basin
 41-50 pts 81-100% of the upstream basin

Technical Planning Process

Scoring Guide 200 Pts.	
A technical planning process was used to arrive at the proposed project.	Up to 150
The project is identified as a priority in a local plan or assessment.	Up to 50

Describe the technical planning used to select this project, and whether it is quantitative or qualitative or a degree of both.

Reviewers will award **up to 50** points (for a possible total of 150 points) for each planning process listed below:

- Basinwide1 or project site field assessment
- Basinwide or project modeling
- Pollution reduction estimate

Why was this project chosen as the best solution over other projects?

Indicate whether the project was identified as a priority in a plan or assessment (e.g. TMDL Water Quality Improvement Report or Water Quality Implementation Plan, presence of 303(d)-Listed water bodies, stormwater basin plan, part of watershed or salmon recovery plan, or other related plan).

Agenda. See http://psp.wa.gov/downloads/AA2011/083012_final/Action%20Agenda%20Book%202012.pdf (char 1,000)

If you are a local government entity, In accordance with RCW 70.235.070 (see <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=70.235&full=true#70.235.070>), describe what policies or measures you have put in place to reduce greenhouse gas emissions apart from this project. (char 1,000)

If the project is a facility construction project, describe the design or construction elements that will result in reduced greenhouse emissions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070 (see <http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=70.235&full=true#70.235.070>) (char 1,000)

Scoring

This form is worth up to **100 total points** as follows.

- **Up to 100 points:** How well does the project address a current permit requirement or TMDL implementation? **OR** How well does the project address other state or federal water quality requirements? **OR** How well does the project address the Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda or current approved plan or program specifically designed to address water quality problems? **AND** How well does the applicant and the project address greenhouse emission reductions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070?

Guidance

- Evaluators award points for projects that address state and federal requirements, projects that address permit requirements, projects that are recommended in approved TMDLs, and projects that are in-line with other state and federal priorities (e.g., permit requirements, watershed plans, Puget Sound Partnership Action Agenda, salmon recovery plans).
- Evaluators award points for straight-to-implementation proposals based on the link between the proposal and the ability to meet water quality standards.
- Evaluators also consider greenhouse gas emission reduction measures by the applicant and the project.

Project Development, Local Support and Past Performance (Refinance projects do not have to fill this portion out) (Scored)

Describe the decision making process used to select this project. Describe efforts to include the community in the decision making process. Why was this project chosen as the best solution over other projects? If the project is described in a local plan, list and discuss the plan. (char 2500)

Describe how you have developed and fostered local, regional and statewide partnerships that will contribute to the success of the project. Describe tangible contributions made by these partners. For nonpoint activity projects implementing BMPs, upload landowner agreements or letters of commitment. (char 2500)

Upload documents

Scoring

This form is worth up to **75 total points** as follows.

- **Up to 20 points:** A comprehensive decision making process was used to arrive at the proposed project.
- **Up to 20 points:** Plans for long-term project success and sustainability were considered during project development.
- **Up to 20 points:** The level of local support and commitment for the project.
- **Up to 15 points:** Past performance on other water quality projects, including Ecology funded projects.

Guidance

- Evaluators award points based on project development efforts and commitments from project partners.
- Evaluators will consider past project successes, including outcomes achieved and performance on project deliverables.

Original Question/Guidance	EAGL Integrated Program Question	Guidance to Reviewers						
<p>Project Team</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="96 391 1100 756"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="96 391 910 439">Scoring Guide up to 50Pts.</th> <th data-bbox="919 391 1100 439">Total 50 Points</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="96 445 910 675">Team members’ roles and responsibilities are well defined and an estimated percentage of time each team member will devote to this project is adequate for the scope of work.</td> <td data-bbox="919 445 1100 675">Up to 30 pts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="96 681 910 756">Team members’ past experience is relevant.</td> <td data-bbox="919 681 1100 756">Up to 20 pts.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Scoring Guide up to 50Pts.	Total 50 Points	Team members’ roles and responsibilities are well defined and an estimated percentage of time each team member will devote to this project is adequate for the scope of work.	Up to 30 pts.	Team members’ past experience is relevant.	Up to 20 pts.	<p>Project Team (Refinance projects do not have to fill this portion out) (Scored)</p> <p>Describe roles and responsibilities of each team member. Include contractors and partner agency roles, as applicable. Include the estimated amount of time each team member will devote to the project. (For example, what percent of each team member's work week will be devoted to this project?) (char 7,000)</p> <p>Describe the relevant skills and qualifications of each team member (do not submit resumes) (char 12,000)</p> <p>Discuss your commitment to maintain staff competencies and responsibilities over the life of the project (char 2,000)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look for all the project roles that will be necessary to implement the scope of work, and whether the role will be filled by the applicant or a hired contractor or consultant. Score “experience” on experience that is relevant to the scope of work. A statement of “25 years of experience” alone should not receive points. . A statement of “experience designing wastewater treatment plants” could receive points for a wastewater design project, but not for a riparian planting project. Applications that are missing critical roles on the project team receive fewer points. Assign points for ‘roles and responsibilities’ and ‘skills and qualifications’ that benefit the project. For full points applicants must commit to maintain adequate staffing with proper training throughout the life of the project. Consider the ability of existing applicant staff to take on additional work, as appropriate. You may use your knowledge of the project team’s past performance when scoring.
Scoring Guide up to 50Pts.	Total 50 Points							
Team members’ roles and responsibilities are well defined and an estimated percentage of time each team member will devote to this project is adequate for the scope of work.	Up to 30 pts.							
Team members’ past experience is relevant.	Up to 20 pts.							
<p>Reviewers will award points based on skills, qualifications, and experience of the project team members.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe roles and responsibilities of each team member. As applicable, include contractors and partner agency roles. Include the estimated amount of time each team member will devote to the project. (e.g., what percentage of each team member’s work week will be devoted to this particular project?) Describe the relevant skills and qualifications of each team member (<i>do NOT submit resumes</i>). Discuss your commitment to maintain staff competencies and responsibilities over the life of the project. 	<p>Guidance</p> <p>Scoring</p> <p>This form is worth up to 50 total points as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 20 points: Team members’ roles and responsibilities are well defined and adequate for the Scope of Work. Up to 20 points: Team members’ past experience is relevant. Up to 10 points: Staffing commitment is well described. <p>Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators award points based on knowledge, skills, abilities, qualifications, 							

Original Question/Guidance	EAGL Integrated Program Question	Guidance to Reviewers								
<p>Local Commitment</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="96 298 1090 830"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="96 298 854 370">Scoring Guide</th> <th data-bbox="867 298 1090 370">Total 50 Points</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="96 379 854 560">The project is included in the applicant’s Capital Improvement Plan, and is considered a priority within the plan.</td> <td data-bbox="867 379 1090 560">Up to 30 pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="96 568 854 709">The project selection included a public involvement process.</td> <td data-bbox="867 568 1090 709">Up to 10 pts</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="96 717 854 830">The level of local support and commitments from project partners is documented.</td> <td data-bbox="867 717 1090 830">Up to 10 pts</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Describe how this project fits in the Capital Improvement Plan for the jurisdiction or entity, and whether it is a priority within that plan. Cite the Capital Improvement Plan reference and a webpage where it is available, or if not online, send an electronic copy with application.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe how you have involved and fostered local public involvement in selecting this project. Describe how you have fostered local, regional, or statewide partnerships for the success of the project. If partners are involved, provide documentation (e.g. letters of commitment, match commitment, interlocal agreements, County Council meeting minutes, homeowner association minutes). 	Scoring Guide	Total 50 Points	The project is included in the applicant’s Capital Improvement Plan, and is considered a priority within the plan.	Up to 30 pts	The project selection included a public involvement process.	Up to 10 pts	The level of local support and commitments from project partners is documented.	Up to 10 pts	<p>Project Development, Local Support and Past Performance (Refinance projects do not have to fill this portion out) (Scored)</p> <p>Describe the decision making process used to select this project. Describe efforts to include the community in the decision making process. Why was this project chosen as the best solution over other projects? If the project is described in a local plan, list and discuss the plan. (char 2500) Describe how you have developed and fostered local, regional and statewide partnerships that will contribute to the success of the project. Describe tangible contributions made by these partners. For nonpoint activity projects implementing BMPs, upload landowner agreements or letters of commitment. (char 2500)</p> <p>Upload documents</p> <p>Scoring This form is worth up to 75 total points as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 20 points: A comprehensive decision making process was used to arrive at the proposed project. Up to 20 points: Plans for long-term project success and sustainability were considered during project development. Up to 20 points: The level of local support and commitment for the project. Up to 15 points: Past performance on other water quality projects, including Ecology funded projects. <p>Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators award points based on project development efforts and commitments from project partners. Evaluators will consider past project successes, including outcomes achieved and performance on project deliverables. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Award more points for projects that describe the decision making process than those that state that a facility plan or TMDL was prepared. For non-point projects, look for local support and efforts to leverage local efforts with our money. Award points for local out-reach and public involvement in the selection process, but award full points only for projects that leverage local support to contribute to the success of the project. Look for land owner agreements at the time of application for non point BMP projects For facilities projects, have ratepayers, landowners, local governments, citizen groups, etc., been involved in the process? Award points according to level of involvement. If the applicant is an existing or recent funding recipient, consult the current or former project manager or read the Final Performance Evaluation to evaluate past performance.
Scoring Guide	Total 50 Points									
The project is included in the applicant’s Capital Improvement Plan, and is considered a priority within the plan.	Up to 30 pts									
The project selection included a public involvement process.	Up to 10 pts									
The level of local support and commitments from project partners is documented.	Up to 10 pts									

Original Question/Guidance	EAGL Integrated Program Question	Guidance to Reviewers								
<p>Readiness to Proceed</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="87 334 919 812"> <tr> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="87 334 919 389">Scoring Guide Up to 125 Pts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="87 389 780 596">Project elements are in place for the project to proceed and documentation is provided (e.g. Planning, Design, Permits).</td> <td data-bbox="780 389 919 596">Up to 75 pts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="87 596 780 681">SEPA review is complete and documentation is provided.</td> <td data-bbox="780 596 919 681">0 or 25 pts.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="87 681 780 812">Cultural Resources (Exec. Order 05-05) is complete and documentation is provided.</td> <td data-bbox="780 681 919 812">0 or 25 pts.</td> </tr> </table> <p>Reviewers will award points based on how soon a project can begin construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Describe the steps you have taken to proceed immediately with the project. Provide detailed information and documentation on project elements such as status of designs, permits, interlocal agreements, landowner agreements, easements, other secured funding, staff, or agency approvals. Describe what environmental review process is complete: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sepa/e-review.html Cultural resource assessment (Executive Order 05-05). http://www.dahp.wa.gov/pages/EnvironmentalReview/Laws.htm 	Scoring Guide Up to 125 Pts.		Project elements are in place for the project to proceed and documentation is provided (e.g. Planning, Design, Permits).	Up to 75 pts.	SEPA review is complete and documentation is provided.	0 or 25 pts.	Cultural Resources (Exec. Order 05-05) is complete and documentation is provided.	0 or 25 pts.	<p>EAGL Form</p> <p>Readiness to Proceed (Refinance projects do not have to fill this portion out) (Scored) Describe the steps you have taken to be ready to proceed immediately with the project. Provide detailed information and documentation on project elements such as status of designs, permits, interlocal agreements, landowner agreements, easements, other secured funding, staff, or agency approvals. If applicable, describe the environmental review completed. This may include: (National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), State Environmental Review Process (SERP) - (see www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/wq/funding/GrantLoanMgmtDocs/Eng/GrantLoanMgmtEngRes.html), State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) - (see www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/sepa/e-review.html), Cultural Resource Assessment - (see www.dahp.wa.gov/programs/shpo-compliance)) (char 4000)</p> <p>Scoring This form is worth up to 75 total points as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 75 points: Project elements are in place for the project to proceed and documentation is provided. <p>Guidance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluators award points based on how soon a project can begin. Projects that rely on landowner cooperation will receive points for documenting landowner commitment for the proposed project. Ecology uses the score on this form as the secondary tie-breaker. If two projects have the same overall score and the same score on the Water Quality and Public Health Improvements Form, Ecology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For full points, applicants should be able to sign an agreement on July 1, and immediately start work. (While Applicants have 10 months to start work, this should be the goal for full “Readiness to Proceed” points.) Look critically for supporting facts, an applicant stating that they will be ready may not be supported. GMA compliance can affect the Readiness to Proceed score. If you have questions, contact the CTED GMA planner for the county. Look for land purchase, permits in place, design complete, landowner agreements in place, equipment purchased, GMA compliance, companion funding or match in place, environmental review 100% complete, etc. Cross check this answer with the scope of work timeline. Landowner agreements are critical where they apply. If the project is not implementing BMP’s,
Scoring Guide Up to 125 Pts.										
Project elements are in place for the project to proceed and documentation is provided (e.g. Planning, Design, Permits).	Up to 75 pts.									
SEPA review is complete and documentation is provided.	0 or 25 pts.									
Cultural Resources (Exec. Order 05-05) is complete and documentation is provided.	0 or 25 pts.									