

description and may be submitted as appendices include the following.

(a) Signed letter(s) from active partners indicating their commitment to implementing the workplan or for specific proposed projects.

(b) A minimum of one signed letter from an entity committing to provide matching funds, either in cash or in-kind goods and services, including the total value of the commitment toward the projects.

(c) For interjurisdictional nominations, a signed letter(s) from the appropriate organization in the adjacent State, Tribe, or country expressing their support and participation in the proposed project(s). For example, a letter from another governor, Tribal leader, State water commissioner, State water quality director, environmental director, or similar positions in Canada or Mexico is acceptable.

(d) Maps (optional).

(e) Supplementary Technical Information (optional). If the proposal includes a new or otherwise not widely known technology or methodology, a one-page description may be appended.

C. Evaluation Criteria

Watershed nominations will be reviewed, evaluated, and scored based on the following criteria with a possible total score of 60 points. In addition to the points awarded for the criteria, up to 5 additional points will be awarded to nominations that are interjurisdictional and have been submitted with the proper supporting letter(s). Rather than having a bonus category, these points will be a subsection of the Broad Support category described below.

1. *Innovation* (10 points). Reviewers will be looking for progressive and forward-thinking projects when evaluating the nominations, and as such, watershed nominations that undertake unique, innovative, or novel approaches to environmental problem-solving will be scored higher. While the Agency recognizes that there can be innovative approaches that are not market-based, maximum points will be awarded to nominations that incorporate market-based approaches to water quality.

2. *Measurement of Environmental Results* (total of 30 points). Successful nominees must demonstrate an in-depth knowledge of the watershed ecology and present a sound approach for potentially combating threats or impairments to the water system. For this criteria, reviewers will focus on the following components:

(a) *Feasibility* (10 points). Reviewers will look at the readiness of the nomination. Those projects that can be

implemented quickly will receive more points. Nominations will be evaluated on the technical merit and adequacy of each project. Reviewers will favor nominations that describe projects that are part of larger comprehensive watershed assessments and plans, and reflect an ecosystem-based approach to conservation and restoration. Points will be awarded based on the overall soundness of the nomination from both an ecological and design perspective. In summary, higher scores will be given to those nominees that have demonstrated an understanding of priority water resource problems within the watershed, have substantially completed the assessment and planning phase, and are prepared to begin work.

(b) *Experience* (5 points). Nominations will be scored based on the qualifications of the nominee focusing on management and technical capabilities. Reviewers will assess the past experience of project leader(s) and/or partners in designing, implementing, and effectively managing and coordinating activities. Communities or organizations that have no prior experience and have developed their preliminary workplan will be evaluated on the basis of their proposal and their potential to effectively manage and oversee all phases of the proposed workplan and demonstrated working relationship with their partners.

(c) *Tangible Measures* (10 points). A nomination will be scored based on how well it is supported by a clearly articulated set of performance and progress measures, and identified environmental indicators. A more detailed monitoring and data collection strategy will be preferred. Reviewers will evaluate the workplan in relation to its likelihood to achieve predicted measurable, defensible environmental results in a relatively short time period, including potentially attaining performance expectations, reaching project goals, and producing on-the-ground, quantifiable environmental change using sound science.

(d) *Integration* (5 points). Reviewers will evaluate the extent to which the workplan and proposed project(s) are linked to other existing State or Federal programs. Points will be awarded to those watershed nominations that integrate the common goals and complement the ongoing efforts occurring at the Federal, State, or local level.

3. *Broad Support* (total of 10 points). Acknowledging and responding to representative interests from a broad and varied perspective is quintessential to any successful watershed enterprise. This criteria can be met by illustrating

and substantiating a strong collaborative effort.

(a) *Partnerships* (5 points). Watershed nominations that incorporate a wide variety of public, private, and non-profit participation will be favored. The score for this criterion will be based on the level to which a nominee can demonstrate strong and diverse stakeholder stewardship and support. Reviewers will look for documented, effective working relationships among State and local entities, along with evidence of broad-based community involvement.

(b) *Interjurisdictionality* (5 points). Points will be awarded to nominations that actively involve more than one governmental entity, be it municipal, county, State, Tribe, Federal or country. Reviewers will look at the depth and breadth of jurisdictional participation and will also take into consideration any significant parties that are noticeably absent in lending their support of the nomination.

4. *Outreach* (5 points). Proposals will be judged on the design and breadth of their outreach program. Those proposals that demonstrate a clear strategy for transferring the knowledge and experience garnered over the next few years to other watersheds with similar environmental conditions will score higher. Points will also be awarded for training and educational approaches to disseminating watershed information.

5. *Financial Integrity* (5 points). Points will be awarded based on the adequacy of the budget information provided, and whether the budget is reasonable and clearly presented. Proposals that exceed the minimum match requirement or can certify a broad range of leveraging capacity will be scored higher.

IV. Call for Nominations

EPA invites each Governor and Tribal Leader to submit nominations for grants under the 2004 Watershed Initiative.

A. Format of Nomination Package

Each nomination package must contain: (1) A one-page cover letter signed by the Governor or Tribal Leader, (2) a title page with appropriate information, (3) an abstract, (4) a workplan description, (5) the budget form, and (6) letter(s) and certification(s) of support. Maps and supplementary technical information are optional. The workplan description of the nomination must be no more than ten double-spaced pages long, using a 12-point conventional font and one inch margins. This section must include all of the required components listed in section III.B. To ensure a fair and equitable