

**SAFE, CLEAN WATER GRANTS PROGRAM
EVALUATION CRITERIA
A2 WATER CONSERVATION**

Criteria	Criteria Name	Max Points (Current)
1	<p>Water savings and research plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Up to 10 points: a description of the potential water savings expressed as gallons per day or acre feet per year. (see template on following page). Include any other potential savings (e.g. energy, environmental, etc.); and Up to 15 points: a scientifically strong research plan that includes the following components: review of past literature (are there existing studies or reports that support the savings estimates?); clearly defined objective and hypothesis; identification of target audience; clear and logical research design (i.e. will you have a control group?); a description of your data collection methods (i.e. will it be metered or will submeters be needed?); and a description of the analysis that will be used. 	25
2	<p>Water Conservation Research Project innovation or new features</p> <p>Response should, at a minimum, answer the following questions: how is the proposed project and/or technology better and/or different than what currently exists? What new markets will it open and how will they be affected? What is the lifespan of the new technology and how reliable is it?</p>	25
3	<p>Cost effectiveness</p> <p>Goal is to fund projects that provide the largest water savings per dollar awarded. Describe your project's potential water savings (Criteria 1) in the context of funds requested and total project costs. If applicable, include cost per gallon saved.</p>	20
4	<p>Market impact potential</p> <p>Response should, at a minimum, answer the following questions: What audience or demographic will benefit from your project? What is the potential market size or impact size for your project?</p>	15
5	<p>Water Conservation Research Project preparedness</p> <p>Please provide a description of your experience or skills that will allow you to complete the proposed project. Also, describe how thoroughly the project will be planned including any preparatory work and understanding of potential obstacles and strategies to overcome them.</p>	15
PROPOSED ADDITIONAL CRITERIA		
6	<p>Financial Stability</p> <p>More than half of the applicants' required matching funds come from a monetary source (not in-kind). Applicant shows strong financial ability to carry-out the project.</p>	5
7	<p>Diverse Applicant Pool</p> <p>The applicant has never received a prior district Safe, Clean Water Program grant (excluding the mini-grant).</p>	5
8	<p>Environmental Justice</p> <p>Proposed project scope of work includes serving/impacting a Disadvantage Community (as defined by California's Environmental Protection Agency).</p>	5
TOTAL POINTS		115

B3 POLLUTION PREVENTION							
Criteria	Criteria Name		Low (0-3)	Moderate (4-7)	High (8-10)	Weight	Max Score
1	<u>PROJECT GOALS & THEMES</u> Proposed project implements pollution prevention, reduction, removal, remediation or improvement activities, either independently or collaboratively. Project may focus on physical improvements under B3 and <u>priority themes</u> as listed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implement specific pollution prevention or reduction activities identified in existing countywide or regional plans • Increase the permeability of urban areas • Increase trash free areas in riparian areas • Prevent pharmaceutical waste and other pollutants from entering our waterways 	Project identifies which specific pollutant is the target of the project	No identification of a specific pollutant(s) as the focus of the project	Project addresses pollutants in priority reaches or areas identified in TMDL or 303d listings	Project addresses pollutants in priority reaches or areas beyond TMDL or 303d listings	0.25	2.5
		Project clearly states how it will prevent, reduce, remove, or remediate the identified pollutant	Able to link project to the District's One Water Objectives (Appendix J)	General description and some specifics of project methods and process for addressing the identified pollutant(s)	Clear and specifics description of project methods and process for addressing the identified pollutant(s)	0.25	2.5
		Physical projects that bring long-lasting solutions beyond the life of the grant funding	Project provides solutions lasting only the life of the grant	Project provides solutions lasting beyond the life of the grant by 1-2 years	Project provides solutions lasting beyond the life of the grant by 3+ years	0.25	2.5
		Establish baselines to account for existing conditions versus new conditions to measure success	No baseline data identified to measure success	Some baseline data identified to measure success	Systematic baseline data identified to measure success of project objective	0.25	2.5
		Maintenance and monitoring	Maintenance and monitoring component identified with no funding source	Maintenance and monitoring component identified with funding source	Maintenance and monitoring component identified, including parameters to be monitored and funding source	0.25	2.5

2	<u>CONNECTIVITY</u> Where applicable, project demonstrates connectivity of two or more related activities consistent with Priority B objectives		No identified connectivity	Connectivity with other planned enhancements, open space, or habitat areas	Demonstrated connectivity with existing enhancements, open space, or habitat areas	0.25	2.5
3	<u>PROJECT SCOPE</u> Proposed project includes a well-defined scope (see Appendix A) with clearly identifies the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description • Tasks • Deliverables • Success measures Outreach/presentation to District Board of Directors 		Most deliverables and associated tasks, success measures are clearly defined	All deliverables and associated tasks, success measures are clearly defined	All deliverables and associated tasks, success measures, and change management tasks are clearly defined	0.75	7.5
4	<u>PROJECT SCHEDULE</u> Proposed project includes a well-defined schedule (see Appendix B), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tasks • Milestones • Deliverables • Performance measures • Project related events • Outreach/presentation to District Board of Directors • Close-out 		Target completion date, key milestone dates (including key events or board presentation dates) are clearly identified	Clear base schedule along with identification of critical path items.	Clear base schedule along with identification of critical path items, and ways to address anticipate schedule slip.	0.75	7.5
5	<u>PROJECT BUDGET</u> Proposed project includes a well-defined budget that clearly identifies the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tasks • Resources • Matching funds 	What tasks are included and which are requested for reimbursement through this grant?	Most budget items align well with those described in scope and schedule	All budget items align well with those described in scope and schedule	Identified budget items for change management beyond well-defined budget.	0.75	7.5
		Level of matching funds (% of total project cost)	25-30% matching funds	31 to 50% matching funds	51% or greater matching funds	0.75	7.5
		Unit cost is reasonable, effective and efficient	Identified unit cost	Identified unit cost and provided benchmark data	Identified unit cost, provided benchmark data, and	0.5	5

					demonstrated competitiveness against cost effectiveness		
6	<u>PROJECT READINESS</u> Readiness of CEQA documents (Categorical Exemption required where a Negative Declaration or EIR is not required) Readiness of Permit documents (if permits are not required give full points)		Notation of CEQA in project application with no clear date of expected completion	Planned completion of CEQA within 1 year of signed agreement	Completed CEQA	0.75	7.5
			Notation of permits in project application with no clear date of expected completion	Planned completion of permits within 1 year of signed agreement	Completed permits	0.75	7.5
7	<u>LIKELIHOOD OF PROJECT SUCCESS</u> Project team has clearly defined roles and responsibilities, and worked successfully from project planning to project completion in the past Assess whether the applicant has applied for grant opportunities (District and otherwise) previously and been successful		Project team has clearly defined roles and responsibilities	Project team worked together on project proposals in the past.	Project team has completed projects successfully.	0.5	5
			Applicant has no experience in applying for grants, District or otherwise	Experience includes having applied and received but not yet completed a grant project	Experience includes having applied, received, carried out a grant project successfully	0.5	5
8	<u>ENCOURAGES COOPERATIVE EFFORTS</u> Assesses how many organizations would benefit and how the project improves coordination	Experience working together collaboratively with other organizations	Worked together for one or more planning or funding proposals	Completed one project working together as a team.	Worked together for 2 or more completed projects.	0.5	5
		Authorization and coordination with land owners or land use planning processes.	No coordination with land owner and land use agencies	Letter of intent or draft resolution with scheduled dates for approval by land owners and land use agency where appropriate	Resolution or support by land owner or land use agency where appropriate	0.5	5
9	<u>KNOWLEDGE SHARING</u> Project demonstrates creativity for	What mechanisms in place to share the	No knowledge sharing beyond project reporting	Quarterly updates incorporated into a project website.	Posting of reports or pictures of project factsheets	0.75	7.5

	knowledge/information sharing	successes and learning throughout the Project			at a project website through periodic newsletters		
	Proposed project includes educational opportunities/ outreach (i.e. outreach in underserved communities, planting seedlings, educational plaques, partnerships with schools and other educational programs) while carrying out physical project improvements	What educational opportunities are included in the project?	Project does not include educational opportunities	Project includes passive educational opportunities (i.e., installation of interpretive signage)	Project includes active educational opportunities (i.e., engagement through meetings, workshops, class visits, etc.)	0.75	7.5
PROPOSED ADDITIONAL CRITERIA							
10	<u>Financial Stability</u> More than half of the applicant's required matching funds come from a monetary source (not in-kind). Applicant shows strong financial stability to carry-out the project.	0-33% of matching funds are from a monetary source	34-66% of matching funds are fund a monetary source	67-100% of monetary funds are from a monetary source	0.5	5	
11	<u>Diverse Applicant Pool</u> The applicant has never received a prior district standard grant (excluding the mini-grant).	Applicant has received at least one standard district grant in the past		Applicant has never received a standard district grant in the past	0.5	5	
12	<u>Environmental Justice</u> Proposed project's scope of work includes servicing/impacting a Disadvantaged Community (as defined by California's Environmental Protection Agency).	Scope of work does not indicate working in a Disadvantaged Community		Scope of work clearly defines how a Disadvantaged community will benefit from the project	0.5	5	
TOTAL POINTS							115

B7 SUPPORT VOLUNTEER CLEANUP EFFORTS & EDUCATION EVALUATION CRITERIA					
Criteria #	Criteria Name	Low (0-3)	High (8-10)	Weight	Max Score
1	<u>PROJECT BENEFITS</u> Proposed project provides one or more of the following benefits: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce contaminants entering our waterways and groundwater • Engage community and supports watershed stewardship • Leverages volunteer community resources for efficient use of funds to support watershed cleanup and education efforts 	Project meets one benefit	Project meets all three benefits	1.0	10
2	<u>PROJECT GOALS</u> Proposed project clearly identifies at least one of three themes listed below and includes measurable outcomes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education and outreach on increasing permeability in urban areas • Education and outreach on increasing trash free locations in riparian areas • Education and outreach for reducing waste and other pollutants in in our waterways (showing benefits through awareness and engagement) 	Identified theme, but measurable outcome has little correlation to the theme	Identified theme clear and specific with measurable outcome(s) including outcomes which demonstrate the inclusion of diverse communities	1.0	10
3	<u>PROJECT SCOPE</u> Proposed project includes a well-defined scope (see Appendix A) with clearly identifies the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description • Tasks • Deliverables • Success measures Outreach/presentation to District Board of Directors 	Scope does not relate to schedule and budget	Well defined scope including items clearly listed and explained, and. clear coordination with schedule and budget	1.5	15
4	<u>PROJECT SCHEDULE</u> Proposed project includes a well-defined schedule (see Appendix B), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tasks • Milestones 	Schedule does not relate to scope and budget	Well defined schedule, including items clearly listed and explained with performance measures, and	1.5	15

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliverables • Performance measures • Project related events • Outreach/presentation to District Board of Directors • Close-out 		coordination with scope and budget, and involvement of District Board of Directors.		
5	<u>PROJECT BUDGET</u> Proposed project includes a well-defined budget that clearly identifies the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tasks • Resources • Matching funds 	25 to 34% matching funds	50% or greater matching funds	0.6	6
		Budget does not relate scope and schedule	Well defined budget including items listed here and coordination with scope and schedule	1.0	10
6	<u>COLLABORATIVE EFFORT</u> Proposed project demonstrates: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages collaborative efforts through partnerships • Outreach to the community • Consistent with land use planning 	1 other collaborating partner on this project	3 or more partners, including partners from diverse communities	0.5	5
		No description of outreach	Demonstrated robust and diverse outreach.	0.5	5
		No Coordination with land use agencies	Receipt or acknowledgement of support from land use agencies where appropriate	0.5	5
7	<u>PROJECT READINESS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Readiness of CEQA documents (Categorical Exemption required where a Negative Declaration or EIR is not required) • Readiness of Permit documents (if permits are not required) • Planned date of completion 	Notation of CEQA in project application with no clear date of expected completion	Completed CEQA	0.3	3
		Notation of permits in the project application with no clear date of expected completion	Completed Permits	0.3	3
		Project completion by June 2021	Project completion by June 2019	0.3	3
8	<u>LIKELIHOOD OF PROJECT SUCCESS</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicant's experience in applying and receiving grants 	Applicant has no previous experience in applying for grants, (District or otherwise)	Experience includes having applied, received, carried out a grant-funded project successfully	0.5	5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Proposal includes performance measures and measurable milestones for determining success of project	No mention of performance measures and/or measurable milestone	Project includes performance measures AND measurable milestones	0.5	5
PROPOSED ADDITIONAL CRITERIA					
9	<u>Financial Stability</u> More than half of the applicant's required matching funds come from a monetary source (not in-kind). Applicant shows strong financial stability to carry-out the project.	0-49% of matching funds are from a monetary source	50-100% of monetary funds are from a monetary source	0.5	5
10	<u>Diverse Applicant Pool</u> The applicant has never received a prior district standard grant (excluding the mini-grant).	Applicant has received at least one standard district grant in the past	Applicant has never received a standard district grant in the past	0.5	5
11	<u>Environmental Justice</u> Proposed project's scope of work includes servicing/impacting a Disadvantaged Community (as defined by California's Environmental Protection Agency).	Scope of work does not indicate working in a Disadvantaged Community	Scope of work clearly defines how a Disadvantaged community will benefit from the project	0.5	5
TOTAL POINTS					115

D3 RESTORE WILDLIFE HABITAT EVALUATION CRITERIA						
Criteria #	Criteria Name	Low (0-3)	Moderate (4-7)	High (8-10)	Weight	Max Score
1	<u>PROJECT THEMES/BENEFITS</u> Proposed project focuses on one or more of the following priority <u>themes</u> : a) Further the wildlife habitat restoration goals of existing plans, e.g. the Santa Clara Valley Habitat Plan and South Bay Salt Pond Restoration Plan b) Restore and protect riparian corridor, tidal or other wetland habitats, including freshwater wetlands and vernal pools c) Protect special status species and support habitat improvements d) Emphasize projects with ecosystem, watershed-scale benefits	Project identifies theme, but measurable outcome has little correlation to theme or benefits	None	Project identifies themes with measurable outcome(s) that demonstrate improvements relevant to theme and benefits associated with D3	1.5	15
	Proposed project provides one or more of the following <u>benefits</u> : <ul style="list-style-type: none">Enhances creek and bay ecosystemsImproves fish passages and habitatLeverages community funding through grantsIncreases collaborations and partnerships for stewardship activities with cities, the County, nonprofit organizations, schools, underserved communities, and other stakeholders	Project meets one (1) benefit	Project meets two benefits	Project meets three (3) or more benefits	1.5	15
2	<u>PROJECT GOALS</u> Proposed project is focused on one or more of the scoring metrics listed below: B1 Creation or restoration of tidal, wetland or riparian habitat B2 Improvement of special status species habitat					

	B3 Fish barrier removal/ fish ladder installation B4 Removal of non-native, invasive plants; Planting of native species Applicant must select one or more subcategory to be scored upon (e.g. B1, B2, B3, and/or B4)					
	B.1 Creation or restoration of tidal, wetland or riparian habitat					
	Quantity	Project results in <2 acres of habitat created or restored	Project results in 2 to 5 acres of habitat created or restored	Project results in >5 acres of habitat created or restored	0.25	2.5
	Species assemblage	Proposed enhancement for single species	None	Proposed enhancement for multiple species	0.25	2.5
	Buffer	Little or no buffer planned between restored habitat and disturbance	50-100 ft. buffer planned	>100ft buffer planned	0.25	2.5
	Monitoring	One year of monitoring or maintenance proposed	2 to 4-year monitoring and maintenance plan proposed	5 years or more monitoring and maintenance plan proposed	0.25	2.5
	B2 Improvement of special status species habitat					
	Species	Proposed enhancement for single special status species	None	Proposed enhancement for multiple special status species	0.5	5.0
	Habitat Quality	Habitat to support one life history phase to occur onsite	Habitats to support all life history phases within dispersal distance of site	Habitats to support all life history phases to occur on-site	0.25	2.5
	Management Plan	No plan for monitoring/management of habitat	Management/monitoring plan included but general with few details	Detailed management/monitoring plan with success criteria included	0.25	2.5

	B3 Fish barrier removal/ fish ladder installation					
	The project helps to create a continuous aquatic habitat corridor for fish with the installation of a fishway or removal of an in-stream barrier.	Project opens up less than 1 river-mile of instream habitat for fish	Project opens up between 1 and 5 river-miles of instream habitat for fish and/or is only designed to allow passage for salmonids	Project opens up > 5 river-miles of instream habitat for fish and is designed to allow passage for all native fish rather than just salmonids	0.5	5.0
	Project installs additional habitat improvements adjacent to removed fish barrier	0 points for no habitat improvements in addition to fish barrier removal	7 points for additional habitat improvements in general	10 points for additional habitat improvements related specifically to fish for which the barrier was removed	0.5	5.0
	B4 Removal of non-native, invasive plants and planting of native species					
	Project length	Short term project (1 year) with minimal monitoring component	Mid-term project (2-3 years), with monitoring component	At least 4 years, with monitoring component	1.0	10
	Revegetation following removal	No active revegetation	Revegetation with natives	Revegetation with local native species (watershed specific)	0.5	5.0
	More credit will be given for the use of locally native species as outlined in the District's Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams	Project includes a planting plan of native species but no follow up maintenance or site preparation	Project includes plan with some maintenance (1-year post-project)	Project includes a comprehensive planting plan and schedule, utilizing locally specific natives as outlined in sources such as the District's Guidelines and Standards for Land Use Near Streams	1.5	15
3	CRITICAL HABITAT OR SPECIES NEEDS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed enhancement provides benefit to habitat on an ecosystem or watershed scale (Priority Theme: d) Proposed enhancement is listed in a published 	0 points for project that is site specific with no description of benefits to larger ecosystem or watershed	None	10 points for project that clearly demonstrates benefits to larger ecosystem or watershed as a whole	0.5	5.0

	document (plan, study, report, etc.) which cites its importance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish baselines to account for existing conditions versus new conditions as a way to measure success Monitoring 	Enhancement (whichever type under Criteria #2) is not identified in a published document or no evidence is provided with the application to indicate so	Enhancement (whichever type indicated under Criteria #2) is identified in a published document	Enhancement (whichever type indicated under Criteria #2) is listed in a published document as critical	0.5	5.0
		No baseline data identified to measure success	None	Baseline data identified to measure success of project objective	0.5	5.0
		Monitoring component identified with no funding source	None	Monitoring component identified with funding source	0.5	5.0
4	<p><u>ACCOMPLISHES DISTRICT MISSION AND OBJECTIVES</u></p> <p><u>Identifies</u> the District ends policy(ies) and related objective(s) that the project meets.</p> <p>District mission: <i>Providing Silicon Valley safe, clean water for a healthy life, environment and economy</i></p> <p>For related objectives: Review the attached <i>One Water Objectives</i> document to identify related objectives. Objectives E, F and G may be the most relevant.</p>	0 points for identified mission component with no specific objective(s) that the project meets	None	10 points for an identified mission component and at least one specific objective that grant funds will support	0.5	5.0
5	<p><u>COOPERATIVE EFFORTS</u></p> <p>Proposed project demonstrates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How many entities are partnering on this project? What geographic area does the project benefit? Applicant applying for District grant program for the first time Consistent with land use planning 	3 points for 1 partner	7 points for 2 partners	10 points for 3 or more partners	0.25	2.5
		3 points for 1 city	7 points for 2 or more cities	10 points for countywide	0.25	2.5
		0 points if applicant has previously applied for District grants (successful or not)	None	10 points for first time applicants	0.25	2.5

		No coordination with land-use agencies	Project includes formal notification to a land-use agency (such as a local municipality) where appropriate	Receipt of support by land-use agency where appropriate	0.25	2.5
6	<u>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT & OUTREACH</u> Proposed project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrates outreach to the community • Project includes educational opportunities/outreach (i.e. planting seedlings, educational plaques, partnerships with schools and other educational programs, outreach to underserved communities) while carrying out physical project improvements 	No description of outreach	Planned outreach (included in scope and schedule)	Demonstrated outreach (already conducted)	0.5	5.0
		0 points for no description of education opportunities	None	10 points for inclusion of educational opportunities	0.5	5.0
7	<u>PROJECT SCOPE</u> Proposed project includes a well-defined scope (see Appendix A) that clearly identifies the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project description • Tasks • Deliverables • Outreach/presentation to District Board of Directors 	Scope does not relate to schedule and budget	None	10 points for well-defined scope including items clearly listed and explained, and, clear coordination with schedule and budget	1.0	10
8	<u>PROJECT SCHEDULE</u> Proposed project includes a well-defined schedule (see Appendix B), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tasks • Milestones • Project-related event • Outreach/presentation to District Board of Directors • Close-out 	Schedule does not relate to scope and budget	None	10 points for well-defined schedule including items listed here and coordination with scope and budget	0.75	7.5
9	<u>PROJECT BUDGET</u> Proposed project includes a well-defined budget (see Appendix C) that clearly identifies the following <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources • Matching funds 	Grantee funding only (in addition to District grant).	2 funding sources (in addition to District grant)	3 or more funding sources (in addition to District grant)	0.25	2.5
		25 to 34% matching funds	35 to 49% matching funds	50% or greater matching funds	0.5	5.0

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tasks 	Budget does not relate scope and schedule	None	10 points for well-defined budget including items listed here and coordination with scope and schedule	1.0	10
10	PROJECT READINESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project completion following agreement execution Readiness of CEQA documents (Categorical Exemption required where a Negative Declaration or EIR is not required) Readiness of Permit documents (if permits are not required) 	3 points for completion within 5 years of signed agreement.	7 points for completion within 2 years of signed agreement	10 points for completion within 1 year of signed agreement	0.5	5.0
		3 points for notation of CEQA in project application with no clear date of expected completion	7 points for planned completion within 1 year of signed agreement	10 points for completed CEQA (as required)	0.5	5.0
		3 points for notation of permits in project application with no clear date of expected completion	7 points for planned completion within 1 year of signed agreement	10 points for completed permits (as required)	0.5	5.0
11	LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grant Experience Performance measures 	0 points if applicant has no experience in applying for grants, District or otherwise	4 points for applied and received and not completed yet	10 points for applied, received, carried out successfully	0.25	2.5
		No mention of performance measures and/or milestones	Includes performance measures OR measurable milestones	10 points for project that includes performance measures AND measurable milestones	0.75	7.5
12	CONNECTIVITY Project demonstrates connectivity	0 points for no identified connectivity	Demonstrates connectivity with existing enhancements, open space, or habitat areas	10 points for demonstrated connectivity with existing enhancements, open space, or habitat areas	0.5	5.0
PROPOSED ADDITIONAL CRITERIA						
13	Financial Stability More than half of the applicant's required matching funds come from a monetary source (not in-kind). Applicant shows strong financial stability to carry-out the project.	0-33% of matching funds are from a monetary source	34-66% of matching funds are fund a monetary source	67-100% of monetary funds are from a monetary source	0.5	5.0

14	<u>Diverse Applicant Pool</u> The applicant has never received a prior district standard grant (excluding the mini-grant).	Applicant has received at least one standard district grant in the past		Applicant has never received a standard district grant in the past	0.5	5.0
15	<u>Environmental Justice</u> Proposed project's scope of work includes serve/impacting a Disadvantaged Community (as defined by California's Environmental Protection Agency).	Scope of work does not indicate working in a Disadvantaged Community		Scope of work clearly defines how a Disadvantaged community will benefit from the project	0.5	5.0
TOTAL POINTS						215

D3 ACCESS TO TRAILS AND OPEN SPACE EVALUATION CRITERIA					
Criteria #	Criteria	Low (0-3)	High (8-10)	Weight	Max Score
1	Applicant's readiness to begin the project.	Project plan ready for implementation within 5 years.	Project plan currently ready for implementation.	0.8	8
2	Status of CEQA process and obtaining of necessary permits.	Project timeline indicates CEQA process and/or other permitting has yet to be initiated	Project timeline indicates CEQA and other necessary permits have been obtained and project completion expected within the next 2 years	0.4	4
3	Project minimizes impacts to the environment.	Project does not include measures to avoid and/or minimize negative impacts to the environment.	Project specifically designed with measures to <u>avoid</u> negative impacts to the environment, or has no negative impacts.	0.4	4
4	Applicant has a plan to maintain the project.	Maintenance plan for project not complete.	Maintenance plan for project is complete, long-term and specific.	0.4	4
5	Project supports additional benefits consistent with District's mission.	Project supports recreation only.	Project supports 2 or more objectives consistent with District mission other than recreation or the preservation of open space.	0.4	4
6	Project incorporates environmental restoration/ enhancement activities and/or protects open space adjacent to trail.	Project does not incorporate restoration/ enhancement activities or protect open space in the project description.	Project incorporates significant restoration/ enhancement activities or protects open space in the project description.	0.8	8
7	Cost to the District as a percentage of the total estimated project cost.	Project provides at least 25% matching fund (i.e., more District funding required).	Project provides >50% matching fund (i.e., less District funding required).	0.8	8
8	Miles of new trail/open space to be created for the amount of funding requested.	Project includes public access to <1 mile of new trail.	Project includes public access to >2 miles of new trail.	0.8	8
9	Project demonstrates its contribution to underserved communities, including the deficiency of similar recreational opportunities in the project area.	Project does not demonstrate benefit to an underserved area and/or fulfill a deficiency in recreational opportunities in its vicinity.	Project demonstrates benefits to an underserved area and/or fulfills a deficiency in similar recreational opportunities in its vicinity.	0.8	8

10	Distribution of trail grant funds per entity and geographic area.	Project received prior trail grant funds from District.	Entity (and geographic area) has not received prior trail grant funding from District.	0.8	8
11	Demonstrates available access (public transportation, persons with disabilities, bicycle lanes, staging areas, access to public restrooms and public parking, etc.) and improves access to public areas.	Project does not demonstrate access to the project site and/or does not improve access to public areas	Project demonstrates access to the project site and offers public access where it is otherwise poor and limited.	0.8	8
12	Demonstrate connectivity to the project site by connections between existing trails, parks and open space or by being a part of a trail network.	Project is a standalone trail with no connections to existing trails, parks or open space.	Project includes a connection between existing trails, parks, and/or open space; and is part of a trail network.	0.8	8
13	Project demonstrates safe passage for public access to trails and open space, including street and bridge crossings.	Project does not demonstrate how public safety is taken into consideration.	Project demonstrates safe public access by recognizing and mitigating high traffic areas, tight corridors, publicly less visible areas, and areas of disrepair.	0.4	4
14	Project receives community support and demonstrates an understanding of the community served.	Project shows no support by the community (i.e. local officials, environmental groups, community groups).	Project enjoys community support from local officials and a broad range of community interests.	0.8	8
15	Project includes educational opportunities/ outreach (i.e. planting seedlings, adopt-a-trail, educational plaques, cleanup, partnerships with schools and educational programs).	Project does not include an element of educational opportunity/ outreach.	Project includes a partnership with a school or the incorporation of an adopt-a-trail or other educational program.	0.4	4
16	Project offers multiple points of interest (historic, cultural, geographic, educational, or scenic) to the public.	Project acts singly as a means of recreation or transportation.	Project acts as a means of recreation AND transportation and incorporates at least one additional point of public interest.	0.4	4
PROPOSED ADDITIONAL CRITERIA					
17	<u>Financial Stability</u> More than half of the applicants' required matching funds come from a monetary source (not in-kind). Applicant shows strong financial stability to carry-out the project.	0-49% of matching funds are from a monetary source	50-100% of monetary funds are from a monetary source	0.5	5

18	<u>Diverse Applicant Pool</u> The applicant has never received a prior district standard grant (excluding the mini-grant).	Applicant has received at least one standard district grant in the past	Applicant has never received a standard district grant in the past	0.5	5
19	<u>Environmental Justice</u> Proposed project's scope of work includes servicing/impacting a Disadvantaged Community (as defined by California's Environmental Protection Agency).	Scope of work does not indicate working in a Disadvantaged Community	Scope of work clearly defines how a Disadvantaged community will benefit from the project	0.5	5
TOTAL POINTS					115