

Boating Infrastructure Grant Program Evaluation Criteria Changes (Tier 1 only)
Adopted by the Recreation and Conservation Funding Board
February 9, 2016 (Item 6, Attachment J)
Resolution #2016-11

New Evaluation Criteria for Tier 1 Projects

| Question | Subject | Maximum Points | Weight (5) |
|------------------------------|--|----------------|-------------|
| 1 | Need, Access, Cost Efficiency | 20 | 51% |
| 2 | Project Design | 3 | 8% |
| 3 | Match and Partnerships | 10 | 26% |
| 4 | Innovation and Environmental Stewardship | 6 | 15% |
| Total possible points | | 39 | 100% |

New/Changed Detailed Scoring Criteria: Boating Infrastructure Grant Program – Tier 1 Projects

Advisory Committee Scored

1. Meet a Documented Need, Improve Eligible Boater Access, and Demonstrate Cost Efficiency (20 total possible points.)
 - (1) Will the proposed boating infrastructure meet a need for more or improved facilities? (0–10 points)

In evaluating a proposed project under this criterion, we consider whether the project will:

 - a. Construct new boating infrastructure in an area that lacks it, but where eligible vessels now travel or would travel if the project were completed;
 - b. Renovate a facility to improve its physical condition, follow local building codes, improve safety, or adapt it to a new purpose;
 - c. Create accessibility for eligible vessels by reducing wave action, increasing depth, or making other improvements;
 - d. Expand an existing facility that is unable to accommodate current or projected demand by eligible vessels; or e. Make other improvements to accommodate an established need.
 - (2) Will eligible users receive benefits from the proposed boating infrastructure that justify the cost of the project? (0–7 points)

In evaluating a proposed project under this criterion, we consider the total cost of the project, the benefits made available to eligible users, and the objectivity or reliability of the data and information used to demonstrate benefits relative to costs. Relate costs and benefits to the need for the project (See § 86.43(a)). We may consider the availability of preexisting structures and amenities, but only in the context of the identified need. As costs vary depending on local factors, we do not use a cost per slip to compare projects. Describe in your application any factors that would influence costs such as:

- a. The need for specialized materials to meet local codes, address weather, future sea level rise, or terrain, or extend useful life;
- b. Increased transportation costs due to facility location; or
- c. Other factors that may increase costs but support needed benefits.

Describe any costs associated with providing a harbor of safe refuge, if applicable.

- (3) Will the proposed boating infrastructure accommodate boater access to significant destinations and services that support transient boater travel? (0–3 points)

In evaluating a proposed project under this criterion, we consider:

- a. The degree of access that the BIG-funded facility will provide; Activities, events, or landmarks near the facility, how well known they are, how long they are available, and how likely they are to attract boaters to the facility.
- b. The availability of services and the degree of safety at and around the facility, the ease of access to these services, and how well they meet the needs of eligible boaters.

2. Project Design (0 – 3 points)

Is the proposal appropriately designed for the intended use?

Evaluators should consider design and construction elements such as:

- Accurate cost estimates
- Aesthetics
- Environmental impacts
- Future maintenance needs
- Materials and specifications
- Risk management
- Space relationships
- User friendly elements
- Universal accessibility

3. Match Requirements and Demonstrate Partnerships (10 total possible points)

- (1) Will the proposed project include private, local, or State funds greater than the required minimum match? (0-7 points)

As given in § 86.56, we will award points under this criterion as follows. Please note that, while in-kind services and materials may be included in the minimum 25 percent match requirement, *your proposal will only be scored on this criterion for additional cash match.*

| Percent Cash Match | Points |
|--------------------|--------|
| 26–30 | 1 |
| 31–35 | 2 |
| 36–40 | 3 |
| 41–45 | 4 |
| 46–50 | 5 |
| 51–80 | 6 |
| 81 or higher | 7 |

- (2) Will the proposed project include contributions by private or public partners that contribute to the project objectives? (0–3 points)

Partners may include non-Federal entities such as sub grantees, private businesses, other State agencies other than the primary recipient of BIG funds, non-profit organizations, or Federal agencies other than the Service. To be considered a partner, the entity must commit a financial or in-kind contribution or take a voluntary action that is necessary for, and directly and substantively contributes to, completion of the project. See § 86.55 and § 86.57 for additional guidance. In evaluating proposed projects under this criterion, we consider:

- a. The significance of the contribution to the success of the project;
- b. How the contribution supports the actions proposed in the project statement;
- c. How the partner demonstrates its commitment to the contribution; and
- d. The demonstrated ability of the partner to fulfill its commitment.

4. Demonstrate Innovation and Environmental Stewardship (6 total possible points)

- (1) Will the proposed project include physical components, technology, or techniques that improve eligible user access? (0-3 points)

In evaluating a proposed project under this criterion, we consider whether the project will increase the availability of the BIG-funded facility for eligible users or improve eligible boater access to the facility. Describe whether you will be:

- i. Using a new technology or technique;
- ii. Applying a new use of an existing technology or technique;

We will consider if you choose to complete the project using an optional or advanced technology or technique. If you choose to go beyond the minimum technical requirements for a project component, you must describe the current standard and

how you will exceed the standard. We will not award points for followings standards set by law.

- (2) Will the proposed project include innovative physical components, technology, or techniques that improve the BIG-funded project? (0-2 points)

In evaluating a proposes project under this criterion, we consider if the project will include physical components, technology, or techniques that are newly available, or repurposes in a unique way. Examples include components, technology or techniques that:

- a. Extend the useful life of the project;
- b. Are designed to help save costs, decrease maintenance, or improve operation;
- c. Are designed to improve services or amenities for BIG-eligible users;
- d. Reduce the carbon footprint of the facility;
- e. Reduce negative environmental impacts (beyond compliance requirements); or
- f. Improve facility resilience.

- (3) Has the facility where the project is located demonstrated a commitment to environmental compliance, sustainability, and stewardship and has an agency or organization officially recognized the facility for its commitment? (0 – 1 point)

In evaluating a project under this criterion, we consider if the application documents that the facility has received official recognition for its voluntary commitment to environmental compliance, sustainability, and stewardship by exceeding regulatory requirements. The official recognition must be part of a voluntary, established program administered by a Federal or State organization. The program must require the facility to use management and operational techniques and practices that will ensure it continues to meet the high standards of the program and must contain a component that requires periodic review. The facility must have met the criteria requires by the program and received official recognition by the due date of the application.

Revised February 2016