

## Sustainable Farms and Fields: Climate-Smart Livestock Management

# Detailed Scoring Criteria – Alternative Manure Management

SCORING CRITERIA	MAX POINTS
<b>PROJECT PLAN AND LONG-TERM VIABILITY</b>	<b>25</b>
<p><b>Project Narrative</b></p> <p>Addressed all requirements of the project narrative, including, but not limited to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided details of the project including site map and project design documents. practices and design life.</li> <li>Technologies affiliated with the project have a track record of success and are commercially available.</li> <li>The contractor installing the technology has experience with similar projects.</li> <li>Provided description of risks and how project team will address risks.</li> <li>The applicant has any contracts needed to execute the plan.</li> <li>Described the plan for long-term project viability.</li> <li>Included an evaluation component to measure the success of the project and to determine whether the goals/objectives were accomplished and build in measurable milestones and a timeline to complete the evaluation before the contract expires. Evaluation plan consistent with the work plan.</li> <li>Demonstrated that the applicant (including its contractors) and cooperating organizations have sufficient staff resources, technical expertise, and experience to successfully complete the proposed project.</li> </ol> <p><b>Work Plan</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detailed Work Plan clearly and concisely described the tasks and activities required to achieve the goals/objectives in the proposed project narrative.</li> <li>Included major work items (including but not limited to permitting, site planning, engineering, construction, equipment, field supervision, health and safety requirements, testing, bonds, cultural resource review)</li> <li>Reasonable estimate of projected timeline for the project to be operating at full capacity included.</li> <li>Demonstrated that all tasks are logical and achievable within the grant term, and with available resources. Identified measurable targets that must be met to accomplish the project within the grant timeline, with specific dates for each target.</li> <li>Long-term operations and maintenance plan included.</li> </ol>	

<b>PROJECT READINESS</b>	<b>10</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provided a description of how the project will impact the DNMP and presented a plan for updating DNMP.</li> <li>b. Applicant demonstrated a clear understanding of the permits necessary for completing the project and has permits in hand (preferred) or a plan for obtaining the needed permits. (Proposals will be competitively evaluated with regard to how far along they are in the permitting process.)</li> </ul>	
<b>BUDGET</b>	<b>15</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Described and quantified sources and amount of local, state, and federal funds, loans, other grants, and all other funding necessary to complete the proposed project.</li> <li>b. Provided a complete Budget addressing issues including, but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Itemized costs consistent with the Work Plan.</li> <li>2. Back-up documentation including quotes, estimates, and equipment details in support of budget costs.</li> <li>3. Overall budget well justified and consistent with Work Plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>c. Provided a clear accounting of all costs associated with all activities necessary to complete the project. Costs appeared reasonable and allowable.</li> <li>d. Budget is realistic and complete.</li> </ul>	
<b>LEVERAGE</b>	<b>10</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Plan will effectively use SCC funds to leverage other funding sources.</li> </ul>	
<b>ESTIMATED GHG REDUCTION</b>	<b>25</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Described the proposed project and explained how it will result in reduction of metric tonnes of Greenhouse Gas (GHG) emissions annually compared to existing practices for the farm.</li> <li>b. Submitted output from CARB AMMP Tool modified for Washington, COMET Farm, or other approved tool. Described and provided justification for all assumptions made in the calculation process.</li> </ul> <p>Applications will be competitively evaluated on their projected emissions reductions per dollar requested.</p>	
<b>OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS</b>	<b>10</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Identified project impact on air quality, odors, water quality improvements and other co-benefits.</li> </ul>	

<p>Provided an explanation of additional co-benefits provided by the project with a written explanation and supporting documentation (as applicable). Co-benefits that can potentially increase the project ranking include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• water conservation measures</li> <li>• water quality improvements</li> <li>• groundwater safety</li> <li>• nutrient management and removal</li> <li>• reduction of odor</li> <li>• development of value-added products such as fertilizers and soil amendments waste heat utilization on the dairy farm</li> </ul> <p>b. Described of how the proposed project will impact the farm's manure storage capacity or overall goals for manure storage &amp; nutrient balance. Supporting documentation must show feasibility and plan for success of any proposed co-benefits. Any assumptions must be explained in sufficient detail.</p>	
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE / SUPPORT FOR UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS</b>	<b>5</b>
<p>Does this project/work address environmental justice or emphasize support of and participation by under-served, vulnerable, or over-burdened populations? For more information on these terms used please consult the <a href="#">SCC's Community Engagement Plan</a>.</p>	
<b>TOTAL POINTS</b>	<b>100 *</b>

\* Reviewers may add up to 5 additional points to score for projects previously submitted (but not funded) during the 2024 AMM funding round.