

SAM Full Proposal (FP) Review

The purpose of the effectiveness monitoring funding is to finance projects that are designed to advance the understanding of effective programmatic strategies for managing stormwater and minimizing impacts to water quality.

The SAM Coordinator and members of the SAM Study Selection Subgroup (S4), will review and score full proposals based on the criteria at the end of this document, past performance as a SAM contractor (if applicable), and technical concerns.

Please submit this form by June 28, 2023.

** Indicates required question*

1. FP Number *

Check all that apply.

- FP 1
- FP 2
- FP 3
- FP 4
- FP 5
- FP 6
- FP 7
- FP 8

2. Reviewer Name *

3. Reviewer Email *

Proposal Review Guidelines

Project proponents were given the following guidelines:

SAM full project proposals will be evaluated by the Study Selection Subgroup, Ecology, and the SAM coordinator.

The format should be in four main sections:

- 1) project purpose (100pts),
- 2) scope of work (100pts),
- 3) project management (50pts), and
- 4) project budget and schedule (50pts).

The project purpose will describe how the project addresses one or more permit condition(s) or the Western Washington Stormwater Management manual and one of the Stormwater Work Group's list of priority topics, how it is relevant to multiple jurisdictions, and how the project demonstrates long-term effects. This section should fully justify the research need, describe similar past projects and outcomes, and clearly describe team member roles.

The scope of work should contain study purpose, objectives, describe study design and methods, and articulate measurable deliverables. These should be aligned with project tasks including at a minimum, as appropriate:

1. Project management
2. Communication plan
3. Data collection design (e.g. monitoring, lit review or survey)
4. Analysis and data management

The project management plan should have clear team structure with highly qualified staff with appropriate levels of effort. Past project performance on similar projects and the successes or lessons learned should be well documented.

The project budget should be consistent with the level of effort described in the scope of work, with the realistic schedule.

Proposal Evaluation

4. Full Proposal Scoring Point Table

For use in evaluation

Full Proposal Scoring

Category	Evaluation Criteria	Maximum Possible Points
Project Purpose 100 Points	Addresses a SAM Round 4 Priority Topic (see Appendix A of SAM 2023 RFP Guidelines). Clearly defines how the study supports implementation of NPDES municipal stormwater permit programs and/or conditions. Articulates how the study or project will inform future permit requirements or permittees' implementation of current permit requirements.	50
	Directly involves multiple permittees who are engaged because the project will benefit their stormwater management.	15
	Advances regional implementation of stormwater management programs. Demonstrates regional or statewide significance or value (i.e., is transferable).	25
	Will sustain long-term benefits and/or deliverables are durable.	10
Project Description and Scope of Work 100 points	Clear project goals and scope of work. Contains a purpose, objective, design, method, anticipated outcomes. Measurable outcomes are tied to project goals.	25
	Detailed description of project tasks. All tasks necessary to complete the project are clearly identified.	25
	Includes specific deliverables linked to project tasks.	25
	Clear plan for communication of project findings.	25
Project Team and Project Management 50 points	Clear team structure with highly qualified staff. Appropriate levels of effort. Assigns appropriate roles and responsibilities to project staff and partners. Includes estimates of necessary time to be dedicated to the project by all team members.	25
	Multiple permittees are actively engaged in the project development and delivery processes.	15
	Past project performance on similar water quality projects is described and successes and/or lessons learned are documented.	10
Project Budget and Schedule 50 points	The budget is consistent with the level of effort described in the scope of work, with a good rationale for how it was calculated.	25
	The schedule is realistic, demonstrates the project is ready to proceed, and includes major dates and milestones and time for review by TAC or liaison.	15
	A distinct cost is provided for each project deliverable.	10

5. A. Proposal Purpose. Evaluation Criteria 1. (max. 50 pts) *

6. A. Proposal Purpose. Evaluation Criteria 2. (max. 15pts) *

7. A. Proposal Purpose. Evaluation Criteria 3. (max. 25pts) *

8. A. Proposal Purpose. Evaluation Criteria 4. (max. 10pts) *

9. B. Project Description & SOW. Evaluation Criteria 1. (max. 25pts) *

10. B. Project Description & SOW. Evaluation Criteria 2. (max. 25pts) *

11. B. Project Description & SOW. Evaluation Criteria 3. (max. 25pts) *

12. B. Project Description & SOW. Evaluation Criteria 4. (max. 25pts) *

13. C. Project Team & Management. Evaluation Criteria 1. (max. 25pts) *

14. C. Project Team & Management. Evaluation Criteria 2. (max. 15pts) *

15. C. Project Team & Management. Evaluation Criteria 3. (max. 10pts) *

16. D. Project Budget & Schedule. Evaluation Criteria 1. (max. 25pts) *

17. D. Project Budget & Schedule. Evaluation Criteria 2. (max. 15pts) *

18. D. Project Budget & Schedule. Evaluation Criteria 3. (max. 10pts) *

19. Comments for project proponents: *

Use this field to provide any technical and additional comments for project proponents to consider. Does the project or study approach seem adequate? Are the parameters and questions detailed enough to meet the objectives? Do the costs look like they are in the anticipated range for the described work?

Recommendations

Please choose at least one recommendation for this proposal.

20. *

Check all that apply.

- Proceed without any changes
- Submit a written response to comments before the presentation
- Resubmit full proposal addressing major technical issues before the presentation
- Do not proceed
- Other: _____

21. Questions/comments for the Study Selection Subgroup or SAM coordinator to consider for next meeting or study selection process?

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms