



Project Scoring and Evaluation Criteria

The Georgia Land Conservation Council and Program awards grant funds and loans to cities, counties, and the Department of Natural Resources after a thorough review and scoring of a Program Application. The Georgia Land Conservation Program utilizes a weighted 3-factor decision making model which allows for funding decisions, and communication to applicants to be transparent, fair, and true to the goals and objectives of the program.

1. Application Score Against Established Program Criteria: 50% weight
2. Project Urgency, Opportunity, and Innovation Factor: 15% weight
3. Funding Leverage and Efficiency Provided by Application: 35% weight

1. Application Score Against Established Criteria

Each application is reviewed, visited, and provided with a score on a 1-100 scale using the scoring key developed by DNR and adopted by the Georgia Land Conservation Council based on how well the proposed project meets the 10 program goals listed in the Georgia Land Conservation Act (O.C.G.A. 36-22-2). These are:

- Water quality protection for rivers, streams, and lakes;
- Flood protection;
- Wetlands protection;
- Reduction of erosion through protection of steep slopes, areas with erodible soils and stream banks;
- Protection of riparian buffers and other areas that serve as natural habitat and corridors for native plant and animal species;
- Protection of prime agricultural and forestry lands;
- Protection of cultural sites, heritage corridors, and archaeological and historic resources;
- Scenic protection;
- Provision of recreation in the form of boating, hiking, camping, fishing, hunting, running, jogging, biking, walking, and similar outdoor activities;
- and
- Connection of existing or planned conservation areas

2. Project Urgency, Opportunity, and Innovation

Each application is reviewed and provided with a project urgency and opportunity score on a scale of 1-100 by GLCP staff. Factors considered and rated are:

- The imminence and severity of threats facing the proposed conservation project (what is the likelihood that the project's conservation values will be lost if GLCP funding is not awarded?);
- The potential loss of leverage funding sources if GLCP funding is not awarded (will non-state funds be lost if the proposed conservation project is not funded?);
- The achievability of the proposed conservation project if funding is awarded (what is the maturity of the project and how far along is the proposed real estate transaction and due diligence work?);
- The level of project innovation, creativity, and vision in achieving land conservation (is the applicant creating or utilizing a new conservation tool or mechanism as part of its project, and is the project part of a strong long range land conservation plan for the applicant?);
- The level of community and conservation partner support (what is the level of awareness and support within the project area jurisdiction and beyond?)

3. Funding Leverage and Efficiency Provided by Application

Each application is reviewed and scored on a 1-100 scale by GLCP staff for the amount of non-state funding it is providing towards completion of the proposed conservation project and the funding efficiency it provides in utilizing GLCP loan and grant funds. Funding sources are analyzed as to whether they are available and accurate.

Three primary funding leverage factors are rated:

- Total non-state dollars provided by the applicant;
- Percentage of the proposed conservation project provided for with nonstate funding; and
- The applicant's ability to afford and willingness to accept a low interest GLCP loan for a portion of the funding request

I. Key For Scoring Applications Against Ten Program Goals/Criteria (100 Points Maximum)

Factor 1: Water Quality Protection for Rivers, Streams, and Lakes:

Water quality of rivers, streams and lakes is impacted by many factors. The potential of a land conservation project to protect water quality will be evaluated based on the following three primary factors:

- a. Water-body specific characteristics;
- b. Parcel/tract specific characteristics;
- c. Watershed context of the project area.

Water-body specific characteristics: **Points Scored**

1. Does the water-body meet its designated use?

YES	5
NO, but a TMDL (total maximum daily load) implementation plan is being executed	3
A TMDL implementation plan has been developed, but has not been executed	1
No TMDL implementation plan has been developed	0

Parcel/tract specific characteristics:

A. Riparian Condition

2. Length of stream(s) or shoreline protected by the project

At least one mile of stream or 1/3 mile of Atlantic shoreline	5
Less than 1 mile but at least 0.5 mile of stream, or between 1/3 mile and 1000 feet of Atlantic shoreline	3
Less than 0.5 mile but at least 0.1 mile of stream or less than 1000 feet of Atlantic shoreline	1
Less than 0.1 mile of stream and no Atlantic shoreline	0

3. *What % of the protected riparian area length spans both sides of the stream?*

100-75%	5
74-50%	3
49-25%	1
Less than 24%	0

4. *Are there man-made structures in the riparian area (such as rip rap, bulkheads, bridges or other shoreline stabilization) that could hinder the riparian function of water quality protection?*

NO	5
YES, but have a minimal impact	3
YES, and have a significant impact	1

4. *What is the general quality and stability of the stream channel or shoreline?*

High 5
(Erosion slight-some bare bank but active erosion not readily apparent. Vegetation dominant. Some rill (gully) erosion but no vegetative overhang. No exposed tree roots. Stream channel or water body appears stable, well-connected to floodplain.)

Medium 3
(Erosion moderate - Bank or shoreline is predominately bare with some rills (gullies) and vegetative overhang. Some evidence of sediment deposition or embeddedness of substrate.)

Low 1
(Erosion severe - Bank or shoreline is bare with rills (gullies) and severe vegetative overhang. Many exposed tree roots. Channel or shoreline may be incised, with steep raw banks. May be disconnected from functional floodplain. Sediment deposition, debris observed. Embeddedness of substrate apparent.)

Poor 0
(Erosion very severe - Bank or shoreline is bare with rills (gullies) and severe vegetative overhang. Many fallen trees, drains and culverts eroding out. Massive slips or washouts common. Channel cross-section is U- shaped and heavily incised. Banks may be steep and raw. Disconnect from floodplain obvious. Stream course or gully may be meandering-cutting into surrounding uplands. Sediment deposition, debris obvious. Embeddedness of substrate obvious.)

B. Freshwater Wetlands or Coastal Marshlands

5. Does the parcel contain tidal or non-tidal wetlands or adjoin tidal marshlands that contribute to water quality protection?

YES, significant highly functional mature wetlands present
(Appropriate hydrological connectivity for landscape position and mature, functional vegetative community) 5

YES, moderately functional wetlands present
(Somewhat altered hydrology for landscape position and early to mid-successional vegetative community or vegetative community with minor invasive species component) 3

YES, minimally functional wetlands present
(Highly altered or minimal hydrology for landscape position; vegetative community dominated by invasive/exotic species or vegetative community not indicative of wetland type) 1

NO, wetlands are not present or are severely degraded 0

C. Land Cover

6. What percentage of the parcel remains in its naturally vegetated state or contains natural vegetation?

100% - 75% 5

74%-50% 3

49%-25% 1

Less than 24% 0

7. What percentage of the parcel contains man made impervious surfaces?

0% - 0.5% 5

0.5% - 1% 3

1% - 3% 1

>3% 0

Watershed context of the project area:

8. Is there a water supply intake downstream of the property?

YES, less than 2 miles away	5
YES, 2-5 miles away	3
YES, greater than 5 miles away	1
NO, water supply intake downstream	0

9. What is the condition of the watershed (10 digit HUC) containing the proposed project area? Calculate the percent of watershed area categorized as impervious surface, defined by the National Land Cover Data Set.

Less than 0-0.5%	5
0.5-2%	3
2.1-5%	1
Greater than 5%	0

Factor 2: FLOOD PROTECTION

1. What percent of the parcel is located within the 100-year flood zone?

Equal or greater than 50%	5
49 – 25%	3
24 – 1%	1
Less than 1%	0

2. What is the total combined length of all first and second order streams protected by the project?

At least one mile	5
Less than 1 mile but at least 0.5 mile	3
Less than 0.5 mile but at least 0.1 mile	1
Less than 0.1 mile	0

Factor 3: WETLANDS PROTECTION

1. Does the parcel contain wetlands?

Parcel includes ecologically significant imperiled wetlands
(Examples include: isolated wetlands in longleaf pine forests, sag pond wetlands in NW Georgia, isolated wetlands in coastal zones, Interdune wetlands, limesinks, Grady ponds, NW Georgia sagponds, Karst zone springs, cypress domes, cypress ponds, gum ponds, Coastal plain herb (pitcher plant) bogs, some Carolina bays, Piedmont upland swamp glades, and other isolated wetlands occurring mainly in the Coastal Plain.) 5

Parcel includes ecologically significant wetlands
(Examples include: bottomland floodplain in major rivers, coastal wetlands, significant palustrine wetlands such as Carolina Bays) Bottomland floodplains associated with major rivers, other forested wetlands containing old growth/mature trees, any coastal zone wetlands, Carolina bays, Okefenokee (bog) swamp, mountain bogs, NW Georgia sagponds, Piedmont gum swamps, significant limesinks, backwater swamps, and other wetland communities with at least a G3 global rarity ranking at the association level.) 3

Parcel includes wetlands, but no ecologically significant or Imperiled 1

Parcel includes no ecologically significant or imperiled wetlands 0

2. Does the wetland support healthy communities of native plant species?

100% - 75% of wetland area supports native species 5

74%-50% of the wetland area supports native species 3

49% - 25% of the wetland supports native species 1

Wetlands do not support native species 0

3. Does the parcel provide a forested buffer (or other buffer of natural vegetation) for the wetlands on-site?

An average of 300' or greater 5

An average of 100'-299' 3

An average of 50'-99' 1

Factor 4: REDUCTION OF EROSION THROUGH PROTECTION OF STEEP SLOPES, AREAS WITH ERODIBLE SOILS, AND STREAM BANKS

A. Protection of steep slopes:

1. How much of the parcel contains areas of steeply (>20%) sloping topography?

Significant amount (more than 50%) of parcel under protection contains slopes >20 percent 5

Moderate amount (25-50%) of parcel under protection contains slopes >20 percent 3

Some (1-24%) of parcel under protection contains Slopes >20% 1

None of parcel contains slopes >20 percent 0

B. Protection of erodible soils (as defined by NRCS)

2. How much of the parcel contains areas of erodible soils?

Significant amount (more than 50 %) of parcel contains erodible soils that would be protected under the project 5

Moderate amount (25-49%) of parcel contains erodible soils that would be protected under the project 3

Some (1-24%) of parcel contains erodible soils that would be protected under the project 1

None of parcel contains erodible soils 0

Protection of stream banks and Shorelines:

3. How wide is the protected riparian area (the riparian area in which no land disturbing activities occur) that contributes to protection of water quality? (Measured in horizontal feet from bank of river, stream, or lake)

200 feet plus 2 ft. for every degree of slope ** 5

Less than 200 feet but at least 100 feet plus 2 ft. for every degree of slope 3

Less than 100 feet but at least 50 feet plus 2 ft. for every degree of slope 1

Less than 50 feet but at least 25 feet plus 2 ft. for every degree of slope 0

****Note:** average horizontal feet from the bank of the stream is determined by using the Corps of Engineers Protocol for Mitigation Banking. This calculation considers additional footage for average riparian slopes. According to the Standard Operating Procedure for Mitigation Banking, water quality benefits diminish more than 200 feet beyond the bank of the water-body.

4. Based on the width of the protected riparian area above, what % is naturally vegetated?

Over 50% natural vegetation	5
Over 50% forested (other than natural vegetation)	3
25-49% natural vegetation or managed forest	1

Factor 5: PROTECTION OF RIPARIAN BUFFERS AND OTHER AREAS THAT SERVE AS NATURAL HABITAT AND CORRIDORS FOR NATIVE PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES

**A. NATIVE PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES OF CONSERVATION CONCERN OR SUITABLE HABITAT PRESENCE/ABSENCE
(See the DNR Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy (CWCS) for species of greatest conservation need)**

1. How many species of conservation concern occur on the property?

More than 5 species	5
3-4 species	3
1-2 species	1
No species	0

**B. BENEFITS TO NATIVE PLANT AND ANIMAL SPECIES
(Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Strategy species of greatest conservation need)**

2. Rate the project's contribution to conserving the majority of the species' range-wide habitat, conserving an essential piece of habitat, or conserving a major population of the rare species:

Major benefits	5
Moderate benefits	3

Minor benefits	1
No species benefits	0

C. SIGNIFICANT NATURAL TERRESTRIAL AND AQUATIC COMMUNITY PRESENCE/ABSENCE

(may include any globally rare – G3 or higher – natural community, as well as very high quality examples of more common communities, especially those listed in appendix C of the CWCS report)

3. How many significant natural communities are supported by the project?

3 or more significant natural communities	5
2 significant natural communities	3
1 significant natural community	1
No significant natural communities	0

D. PARCEL DISTURBANCE

4. What percent of the property was been disturbed by human activities or non-native invasive species?

None of the parcel is disturbed	5
1%-32% is disturbed	3
33%-65% is disturbed	1
66%-100% is disturbed	0

E. RESTORATION POTENTIAL

5. When considered in the context of the surrounding landscape, the parcel contains none, few, some/most or all of the naturally occurring biotic and abiotic components and ecological processes necessary to maintain and provide habitat for species or natural communities tracked by the Georgia Natural Heritage Program?

All	5
Some/most	3
Few	1

None 0

F. CONTRIBUTION TO LANDSCAPE-LEVEL CONSERVATION

6. What is the project's contribution to landscape-level conservation with regard to its location within areas identified in Georgia's CWCS?

Project located within CWCS Conservation Opportunity Area 5

Project located within CWCS priority watershed 3

Project not within CWCS area or watershed 0

Factor 6: PROTECTION OF PRIME AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY LANDS

A. AMOUNT OF PRIME FARMLAND AND/OR PRIME FORESTLAND

1. What percent of the property is covered by Prime Farmland (as defined in the Code of Federal Regulations, Title 7, Volume 6) or Prime Forestland (as determined through consultation with the Georgia Forestry Commission)?

Significant amount (>66%) of parcel consists of prime land 5

Moderate amount of parcel (33-66%) consists of prime land 3

Some of parcel (5-32%) consists of prime land 1

Little or none of parcel (<5%) consists of prime land 0

B. HIGH QUALITY FARMLAND AND/OR FOREST LAND

2. Does the project protect high quality or threatened farmland (based on data from the American Farmland Trust "Farming on the Edge Map of Farmland Threatened by Development") OR forestland located in Forest Legacy Area (Based on Forest Legacy Map)?

Parcel located in area of high-quality farmland and/or within the Forest Legacy Area and has high development threat 5

Parcel located in area of high quality farmland and/or Forest Legacy area with low development threat 3

Parcel not located in area of high quality farmland and/or FLA 0

C. ELIGIBLE ACRES BEING OFFERED FOR PROTECTION

3. *What percent of eligible acres are being offered by permanent protection?*

100% eligible acres (under contiguous ownership) being offered for conservation easement or fee 5

67% - 99% eligible acres offered for conservation easement or fee 3

34 - 66% eligible acres offered for conservation easement or fee 1

D. SIZE

4. *What is the size (acreage) of the project?*

1,000 acres or larger 5

500 - 999 acres 3

100 - 499 acres 1

Factor 7: PROTECTION OF CULTURAL SITES, HERITAGE CORRIDORS, AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL OR HISTORIC RESOURCES

Definitions relative to cultural sites, heritage corridors, and archaeological and historic resources:

Significance – refers to the role or importance a resource plays in our understanding of prehistory/history.

Integrity – refers to a resource’s ability to convey its significance. According to the evaluation criteria set forth by the National Park Service, there are seven aspects of integrity:

Location – the place where the resource was constructed or the historic event took place

Design – the combination of elements that create the form, plan, space, structure, and style of a resource

Setting – the physical environment of a resource

Materials – the physical elements that were combined or deposited during a particular period of time and in a particular pattern or configuration to form a resource

Workmanship – the physical evidence of the crafts of a particular culture or people during any given period in history/prehistory

Feeling – a resource’s expression of the aesthetic or historic sense of a particular period of time

Association – the direct link between an important historic event or person and a resource

Uniqueness – refers to both the temporal/cultural association of the resource AND/OR the geographic location of the resource. For example, a parcel would score “Very High” in uniqueness if it were the only known example of a prehistoric bead workshop in the Coastal region. Likewise, a resource might score high in this field if there are no publicly available interpreted resources in the specified geographic region.

Threat Level – refers to the potential danger a resource faces if it is not acquired through the LCP. This field will take into consideration things such as encroaching development, vandalism/looting, and natural threats such as erosion/attrition.

Feasibility – refers to the feasibility of acquiring a specific tract of land in terms of the willingness of the landowner to sell, the asking price, and the ability of the applicant to manage said property.

Compatibility – refers to the compatibility of the cultural resource preservation goal(s) with other goals set forth in the Georgia Land Conservation Act. For example, a parcel would score “Very High” if its acquisition would reduce erosion, protect riparian buffers, AND protect Mississippian village site on the Etowah River. A property might score “High” if its acquisition would preserve water quality AND protect a historic river commercial district from modern construction. A property might score “Low” if its acquisition would ONLY protect a cultural resource from encroaching development.

Buffering – refers to lands which will serve to protect existing cultural resources from visual or other adverse effects, e.g., Etowah Mounds SHS.

1. Does the project contain a known cultural resource (i.e., archaeological site, historic building/structure, cultural landscape)?

Yes, there is a known cultural resource(s) on the subject property 5

There is no known cultural resource(s), but there is a high probability that the subject property contains an unknown cultural resource(s) 3

There is no known cultural resource(s), but there is a moderate probability that

the subject property contains an unknown cultural resource(s) 1

There is no known cultural resource(s) and there is no or low probability that the subject property contains an unknown cultural resource(s) 0

2. Does the project focus on the following preferred cultural resource topical areas?

- Prehistoric Indian life ways (ca. 13,000 BC – AD 1540)
- Early historic period Indian life ways (ca. 1540-1733?)
- Spanish mission system (ca. 1540-ca. 1700)
- English colonization (ca. 1733-1776)
- American Revolution (1776-1783)
- Frontier (1783-1839)
- War of 1812 (1812-1814)
- Gold Rush (ca. 1829)
- Indian Removal (Creek and Cherokee Trail of Tears, ca. 1820-ca. 1839)
- Civil War (1861-1865)
- African American culture
- Reconstruction and the New South (1865-1917)
- The World Wars and the inter-war years
- Civil Rights movement
- Underwater Archaeology

The project focuses intensively on more than one of the Topical areas 5

The project focuses intensively on one of the topical areas 3

The project includes one of the topical areas 1

The project does not include or focus on any of the topical areas 0

3. Each project will be scored by DNR using the matrix below, however the applicant is encouraged to score the project itself as a guide.

Georgia Land Conservation Act Cultural Resources Acquisition Priority Matrix

	Very High (3 pts)	High (2 pts)	Moderate (1 pt)	Low (0 pts)
Significance				
Integrity				
Uniqueness				
Threat Level				
Compatibility				
Buffering				
Feasibility				
TOTALS				

Score of 15-21 on the project review matrix	5
Score of 8-14 on the project review matrix	3
Score of 1-7 on the project review matrix	1
Score of 0 on the project review matrix or N/A	0

4. What does the sponsor plan to do with the subject property and any extant cultural resource(s)?

Plans to conserve and publicly interpret cultural resource(s)	5
Plans to preserve cultural resource(s) with no interpretation	3
Plans to conserve/utilize property in way(s) that have no effect on cultural resource(s)	1
Plans to utilize/restore/enhance property in way(s) that will have an adverse effect on cultural resource(s)	0

Factor 8: SCENIC PROTECTION (SCENIC FEATURES ARE NATURAL, HISTORICAL, OR CULTURAL FEATURES)

1. What is the quality of the scenic features present on the parcel?

Excellent	5
Good	3
Fair	1
None	0

2. Are the site's scenic features visible OR OPEN TO the public?

High visibility to the public	5
Moderate visibility to the public	3
Limited visibility to the public	1
Not visible to the public	0

Factor 9: PROVISION OF RECREATION IN THE FORM OF BOATING, HIKING, CAMPING, FISHING, HUNTING, RUNNING, JOGGING, BIKING, WALKING, AND SIMILAR OUTDOOR ACTIVITIES

1. *Is the parcel suitable for public hunting?*

All levels of hunting	5
Limited levels of hunting	3
No hunting at all	0

2. *Does the parcel provide access to a river, lake, or stream for public fishing?*

YES	5
NO	0

3. *Does the parcel have potential for boat ramp, pier or other structure to aid bank and boat anglers?*

YES	5
NO	0

4. *Is the parcel suitable for recreational uses such as hiking and camping?*

YES	5
NO	0

5. *Is the parcel suitable for development of walking and jogging trails?*

YES	5
NO	0

6. *Is the parcel suitable for cycling or swimming?*

YES	5
NO	0

7. *Is the parcel suitable for development as a park or recreation area?*

YES	5
-----	---

NO 0

8. If suitable for development as a public recreation area, is the parcel within a 50-mile radius of a population of (choose only one point value based upon population within radius):

More than 1 million 5

550,000-999,999 3

100,000-549,999 1

Less than 100,000 0

9. Is the parcel accessible over paved public roads?

YES 1

NO 0

10. Is the parcel within 10 road miles of an interstate highway?

YES 1

NO 0

Factor 10: CONNECTION OF EXISTING OR PLANNED AREAS CONTRIBUTING TO THE GOALS SET OUT IN THIS PARAGRAPH

A. LANDSCAPE CONNECTIVITY

Floodplains, riparian corridors, mountain ridges or other broad scale ecological features provide critical habitat corridors for terrestrial and aquatic species. ("Conservation lands" are those included in the State Land Conservation GIS database, managed by DNR.)

1. What is the level of connectivity that the parcel contributes?

Parcel provides high connectivity to existing conservation lands 5

Parcel provides moderate connectivity to existing conservation lands 3

Parcel provides low connectivity to existing conservation lands 1

Parcel provides no connectivity to existing conservation lands 0

B. Recreational Connectivity

2. What level of recreational connectivity does the parcel provide?

Parcel provides high connectivity to existing public conservation lands	5
Parcel provides moderate connectivity to existing public conservation lands	3
Parcel provides low connectivity to existing public conservation lands	1
Parcel provides no connectivity to existing public conservation lands	0

C. Regional Plan

3. Is the parcel located within an area identified for a regional conservation project?

YES	5
NO	0

D. LOCAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

4. Is the parcel located within an area identified for conservation in the local comprehensive plan, or where adjacent zoning will not inhibit the ability of the parcel to function as conservation land?

YES	5
NO	0

II. Key For Scoring Applications Against Project Urgency, Opportunity, and Innovation Criteria (100 Points Maximum)

Factor 1: The imminence and severity of threats facing the proposed conservation project (20 points maximum):

	Points Scored
There are no known imminent threats facing the property	0
Threats to the property are minor or would not have a major negative effect on the conservation values present	5
Threats to the property are moderate and could have a negative effect on the conservation values present	10
The property is likely to be sold to another buyer and be used in a manner that would have a negative effect on the conservation values present	15
The property is imminently threatened with conversion to a use that is inconsistent with protection of the conservation values present	20

Factor 2: The potential loss of leverage funding sources if GLCP funding is not awarded (20 points maximum):

There are no non-state leverage funding sources at risk of loss	0
There are non-state leverage dollars at risk that may be lost to the Georgia Land Conservation Program, if the project is not funded	5
There are non-state leverage dollars at risk that may be lost to the Georgia Land Conservation Program, if the project is not funded and their loss may jeopardize the project	10
There are significant non-state dollars at risk (>\$100,000) that will be lost to the Georgia Land Conservation Program, if the project is not funded and their loss jeopardizes the project	20

Factor 3: The achievability of the proposed conservation project if funding is awarded (20 points maximum):

The applicant is committed to completing the project but has not reached a verbal agreement with the landowner nor initiated due diligence efforts	5
The applicant has reached a verbal agreement with the landowner but has not initiated due diligence efforts	10

The applicant has reached verbal agreement with the landowner and an appraisal has been completed but remaining due diligence has not been completed 15

The applicant has an option to purchase the property or an easement has been drafted and agreed to and all due diligence is complete or underway 20

Factor 4: The level of project innovation, creativity, and vision in achieving land conservation (20 points maximum):

Applicant is not creating or utilizing a new conservation tool or mechanism as part of its project, nor is the project part of a long range land conservation plan 0

Applicant is utilizing a new, creative, or visionary mechanism in achieving this conservation project or it is part of a strong long range conservation plan 10

Applicant is utilizing a new, creative, or visionary mechanism in achieving the conservation project and it is part of a strong long range conservation plan 20

Factor 5: The level of community and conservation partner support (20 points maximum):

The applicant supports the project and is committed to seeing it completed 5

The applicant is providing some of its own funds or has the support of one additional conservation partner, community group or public official 10

The applicant is providing some of its own funds and/or has the support of more than one conservation partner, community group or public official 15

The applicant is providing some of its own funds and/or is working in concert with multiple conservation partners, community groups or public officials 20

III. Key for Scoring Program Application Against Funding Leverage and Efficiency Criteria (100 Points Maximum)

Factor 1: Total non-state dollars provided by the applicant (34 points max.)

Points Scored

\$0	0
\$0 - 49,000	5
\$50,000 – 99,000	10
\$100,000 – 249,000	15
\$250,000 – 499,000	20
\$500,000 – 999,000	25
\$1,000,000 and above	34

Factor 2: Percentage of the proposed conservation project provided for with nonstate funding (33 points maximum):

0%	0
1-9%	5
10-24%	10
25-49%	20
50-74%	25
75-99%	33

Factor #3: Applicant's ability to afford and willingness to accept a low interest GLCP loan for a portion of the grant request (33 points maximum):

Applicant not willing to accept a loan	0
Partial grant funding acceptable. Applicant can carry out project in stages and/or is unsure of willingness to accept a loan but is willing to pursue a loan	10
Applicant is unable to afford a loan for the full amount of the application	15
Applicant is willing to accept a part grant/part loan combination	20
Applicant is willing to accept a loan up to the amount they can afford	25
Applicant is willing to accept a loan for the full amount of the application	33