

**Table 3: SFY19 Application Rating Criteria**

<b>Application Rating Criteria and Guidance</b>
<b>Funding Request</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0-15 points:</b> Applicant has identified adequate matching funds. (Full points if no match is required.)</li> </ul>
<b>Scope of Work - Additional Tasks</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0-75 points:</b> The scope of work represents a complete and concise description of the project tasks and outcomes, including deliverables. To receive full points, scope of work must align with the schedule and detailed budget.</li> </ul>
<b>Task Costs and Budget</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0-50 points:</b> The application demonstrates how the applicant arrived at the cost estimate for each task. The process used by the applicant to develop this estimate is based on real-world data.</li> <li>• <b>0-85 points:</b> The cost to complete the scope of work is reasonable when compared to similar projects in the region.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Team</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0-50 points:</b> Team members' roles and responsibilities are well defined and adequate for the scope of work. Team members' past experience is relevant to the proposed project. Applicant has a plan in place to maintain sufficient staffing levels to complete the project.</li> <li>• <b>0-15 points:</b> The applicant documents successful performance on other funded water quality projects, including Ecology funded projects. Previously constructed projects provided the water quality benefits described in the project application on time and within budget.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Schedule</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0-25 points:</b> The project schedule includes all tasks including pre-project administrative elements such as permitting, MOUs, landowner agreements, etc., and provides sufficient time to complete all elements.</li> <li>• <b>0-75 points:</b> The applicant is ready to start on the proposed scope of work and can begin drawing down funds.</li> </ul>
<b>Project Planning and Development</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0-40 points:</b> Applicant used a complete and well-defined set of criteria to determine the value and feasibility of the proposed project and included the useful life and long-term maintenance costs in their evaluation of the project and project alternatives.</li> <li>• <b>0-20 points:</b> Applicant has provided documentation showing that key stakeholders have been identified and will support the project.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Quality and Public Health Improvements</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0-135 points:</b> Project proposes to reduce or prevent pollution in a waterbody that has been identified as a priority by a local, state or federal agency through the development of a federal, state or local water quality plan.</li> <li>• <b>0-150 points:</b> The proposed project area is directly connected to the water body identified for improvement and applicant has provided sufficient technical justification to show the proposed project will reduce the pollutants of concern in the water body identified for improvement.</li> <li>• <b>0-50 points:</b> Applicant has identified how each task will be evaluated in order to determine success, noted if the measure is quantitative or qualitative, and defined a goal.</li> <li>• <b>0-100 points:</b> The project represents a good value for the water quality benefits that will be achieved.</li> <li>• <b>0-50 points:</b> Applicant has a plan and commitments in place to fund long-term maintenance and sustain the water quality benefits of this project.</li> <li>• <b>0-15 points:</b> How well does the applicant and the project address greenhouse gas emission reductions in accordance with RCW 70.235.070?</li> </ul>
<b>Financial Hardship</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>0 points:</b> If the applicant does not meet the criteria for financial hardship.</li> <li>• <b>50 points:</b> If the applicant meets the criteria for financial hardship.</li> </ul>
<b>Total Possible Points = 1,000</b>

## Rating and Ranking Process

Before rating and ranking projects, Ecology headquarters staff screened and verified the general eligibility of each application.

Two Ecology regional staff with water quality technical expertise independently rated each eligible proposal. One evaluator was from the region where the proposal originated, and the other was from a different region. Ecology averaged the two scores to obtain the final score. In cases where the two scores deviated by more than 100 points, an evaluator from Ecology headquarters conducted a third independent evaluation, and staff averaged the two closest scores to obtain the final score.

In order to be eligible for funding, a proposal must have received an overall score of at least 600 points and scored at least 250 points on the Water Quality and Public Health Improvements portion of the application.

## Unrated Proposals

Staff determined that five proposals were ineligible for funding. Staff did not rate or rank the ineligible projects.

There were two applications for refinancing debt for a completed wastewater facility construction project. Because Ecology only funds standard refinance projects after all other eligible projects are funded, staff did not rate or rank the refinance projects.

## Tiebreakers

If two projects had the same total score, Ecology first used scores on the Water Quality and Public Health Improvements form to break the tie. If a tie remained, Ecology used scores on the Project Schedule form. If a tie still remained, Ecology then used scores on the Task Costs/Budget form to break the tie. If a tie still remained, and both projects were eligible for FP loans, but there was insufficient FP available for both projects, Ecology offered the FP loan to the applicant with the highest unemployment rate.

After completing the rating process, Ecology staff generated the ranked list of project proposals based on the final average scores. The full ranked list is presented in Appendix 1.

## Available Funding, Set-asides, and Limits

Funding levels vary from year to year, depending on state and federal appropriations. Administrative rules, program policies, legislative directives, federal grant conditions, and funding levels result in requirements that Ecology set aside portions of the available funding for particular purposes and impose limits on uses and amounts. The set-asides and limitations vary from year to year. The following are some specific funding estimates, set-asides, and limitations for the programs.

### CWSRF

There is \$115,000,000 available for CWSRF loans. See Appendix 1a for a list of projects offered CWSRF funding.