Applicant:		Requested Funding:	Scorer:

Scoring Instructions: Please use the below questions to objectively rate the grant application. Each question can be rated from 0 to the maximum available points listed, with the maximum amount of points indicating that the applicant completely fulfilled the question's requirements. Additionally, scorers are strongly encouraged to provide comments, especially if the score given is less than half of the available points. Short notes or a word or two that will jog your memory are sufficient; however, stick to facts and issues. For example, comments might include: "realistic 6-month schedule, very achievable." Comments allow for the best defense of an award recommendation in the event of an award protest or if the applicant has questions. Additionally, please do not discuss applications with other scorers. Each scorer should review and score independently. Scorers will have the opportunity to discuss their scores, pose questions to the applicant, and make adjustments to their scores as necessary during the scoring sessions.

Scoring Sheet - Local Government Project	Available Points	Score	Scorer Comments
Budget, 20 points			
Is the budget completed correctly? (i.e. correct categories for items, designate requested FY, no items under the $500 line item minimum, etc.)	4 points	4	
Are the expenses itemized with an appropriate unit cost?	4 points	4	
Do the requested budget items and amount seem appropriate for the intended project?	4 points	4	
Is the supplemental documentation included sufficient in order to be awarded grant funds?	4 points	4	
Did the applicant compare the cost of items to established averages or to normal costs for similar projects?	4 points	4	
Timeline, 10 points			
Did the applicant adequately describe the major steps or activities involved in the project?	2 points	2	
Did the applicant identify the responsible party for completing each task?	2 points	2	
Did the applicant establish a realistic timeline for the project?	2 points	2	
Is the timeline organized?	2 points	2	
Is the timeline consistent with the rest of the application? Is each step or task described in terms of its effect on the total project budget?	2 points	2	
Project Narrative, 60 points + 10 bonus points			
Narrative, 5 points			
Is the project narrative free of grammar/spelling/other mistakes?	2 points	2	
Is the project narrative consistent with the rest of the application?	3 points	3	
Demonstrated Funding Need, 20 points			
Did the applicant clearly identify their funding need?	6 points	6	
Does the project narrative clearly explain the project, including the scope and overall goal or objective?	6 points	6	
Does the applicant clearly identify how the purchases will improve materials management in/at their entity?	6 points	6	
Did the applicant provide any local match or in-kind commitment?	2 points	2	
Project Impacts and Benefits, 20 points			
Does the applicant clearly identify the benefits of the grant?	4 points	4	
Does the applicant clearly define any partnerships or collaborations? (public-public, public-private partnerships, etc.)	4 points	4	
Does the applicant identify how the project will be sustained beyond the term of the grant? (i.e. will they be able to cover the cost to maintain equipment, etc.)	3 points	3	
Does the applicant adequately describe how they will be measuring progress and benefits? (i.e. tons of waste diverted from the landfill, amount of participants/volunteers, etc.)	3 points	3	
Does the applicant identify any specific waste stream issues?	3 points	3	
Does the applicant clearly define the estimated number of people who would be served or benefited by the project? Is the geographic area affected by the project clearly described?	3 points	3	
Regional Advancement of Materials Management, 15 points + 10 bonus points			
Will the project advance the applicant's materials management program and/or materials management in the region?	3 points	3	
Does the applicant demonstrate additional environmental quality of life benefits (i.e. air quality, water quality, or social responsibility benefits)? Will this project have an impact on the quality of life for residents?	3 points	3	
Will this project incorporate new technologies, infrastructure, or other new benefits not previously offered by the applicant?	3 points	3	
Can this project be emulated or scaled to other entities?	3 points	3	
Is the project a demonstration or pilot project that establishes or advances the applicant's materials management program?	2 points	2	
Has the applicant demonstrated a commitment to preferred solid waste management practices? (i.e. implementing other solid waste management projects, being involved with solid waste groups (ex. KTB, TxSWANA, STAR), development of local solid waste management plans and/or priorities, etc.)	1 points	1	
Does this project exemplify substantial *impacts and benefits to advance materials management initiatives? Does this applicant have a* considerable *need for this grant?*	BONUS: 10 points	10	
NCTCOG Staff Checklist, 10 points + 5 bonus points			
Did the applicant complete all portions of the application, including providing supplemental documentation?	5 points	5	

Does the proposed project conform to eligible standards, eligible recipient standards, and allowable expenses and funding standards, as established by TCEQ and NCTCOG and under all applicable laws and regulations?	5 points	5	
Has the applicant demonstrated the ability to complete previous grants effectively (i.e. submitting reports on time, submitting accurate reports and requests for reimbursement, communicating effectively with NCTCOG staff as needed, etc.)?	***Great Grant History*** *- bonus up to 5 points* ***No grant history*** *(has not been awarded a SW Grant from NCTCOG) - 5 points* ***Poor Grant History*** *- deduction up to 5 points*	5	
	TOTAL SCORE:	**115**	

Additional Scorer Comments: