

The function of the Program Priority System is to enable reviewers to objectively and quantitatively score applications commensurate with the impact of the project proposal on the reduction of waste, increased recycling, composting, market development for recyclable produces, public education and planning, increased technical assistance, implementation of household hazardous management programs, and removal of barrier to waste reduction in the service area.

Public Education

| 1) How well are the project and accomplishments described? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Described well, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Described fairly well, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not defined | 1 |
| d) No description of project and/or accomplishments given | 0 |

| 2) Does the timeline list specific tasks, milestone dates and accomplishments during the year? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) No clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Missing some milestone dates; few tasks listed, accomplishments not mentioned | 1 |
| d) No timeline, no tasks listed, no accomplishments listed | 0 |

| 3) Is the service area defined? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Very well defined, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Defined, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not defined | 1 |
| d) No service area given | 0 |

| 4) Are the project's benefits for service area and/or targeted group defined? | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) Very well defined, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Defined, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not defined | 1 |
| d) Project's benefits for service area and/or targeted group are not defined | 0 |

| 5) Is the need for this project described? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Very well defined, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Defined, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not defined | 1 |
| d) Project need was not determined | 0 |

| 6) Does the applicant provide a mechanism to measure/analyze project effectiveness? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Mechanism gives measured quality results, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Mechanism does not accurately measure/analyze program effectiveness; revision/clarification needed but data gathered | 3 |
| c) Mechanism to measure/analyze project effectiveness does not measure and/or analyze project effectiveness | 1 |
| d) No mechanism to measure/analyze project effectiveness used | 0 |

Public Education (cont.)

| 7) Explain how your project/program will achieve demonstrable direct results | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Easily understood and relatable, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Understood and relatable, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but no explanation given | 1 |
| d) No explanation for achieving demonstrable results given | 0 |

| 8) Are there other providers or entities that provide similar services as this project? If so, please explain how this project is different. | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Explanation is easily understood and relatable, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Explanation is understandable and relatable, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Other providers mentioned, but no explanation for the project difference | 1 |
| d) No explanation about providers of same service or project differences | 0 |

| 9) Possibility of project partners/potential for partnership(s) | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) Very well explained, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Brief explanation, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned, not explained | 1 |
| d) No explanation for potential partnerships is given | 0 |

| 10) Project continuation after funding has ended | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) Very well explained, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Brief explanation, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not explained | 1 |
| d) No explanation for project continuation after funding has ended | 0 |

| 11) Program promotion of litter reduction | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) Very well explained, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Brief explanation, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not explained | 1 |
| d) No explanation of a litter reduction program | 0 |

Cash Match / In-Kind Match

A **Cash Match** is when goods or services are paid by your organization with funds other than grant funds.

A Non-cash **Match** is when goods or services are paid by a 3rd party such as a person / city / organization outside of your organization – usually includes volunteers.

Ranking Points:

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| 50% to 100% | 10 points |
| 25% to 49% | 5 points |
| 0% to 24% | 0 points |

Cleanup

| 1) How well is the service area defined? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Very well defined, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Defined, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not defined | 1 |
| d) No service area given | 0 |

| 2) How many different types of items from the litter cleanup will be recycled (e.g. aluminum, paper, glass, metal and/or plastic)? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) At least 5 types | 5 |
| b) At least 4 types | 4 |
| c) At least 3 types | 3 |
| d) At least 2 types | 2 |
| e) At least 1 type | 1 |
| f) Nothing from the litter cleanup will be recycled | 0 |

| 3) Does the applicant provide a mechanism to measure/analyze project effectiveness? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Mechanism gives measured quality results, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Mechanism does not accurately measure/analyze program effectiveness; revision/clarification needed but data gathered | 3 |
| c) Mechanism to measure/analyze project effectiveness does not measure and/or analyze project effectiveness | 1 |
| d) No mechanism to measure/analyze project effectiveness used | 0 |

| 4) Extent to which program builds on an existing program | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Directly builds on existing program | 5 |
| b) Mostly compliments existing program | 3 |
| c) Slightly compliments existing program | 1 |
| d) No connection to any existing program | 0 |

| 5) Amount of staff experience with this type of program | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) All staff members have extensive experience | 5 |
| b) Some staff members have experience | 3 |
| c) At least one staff members has experience | 1 |
| d) None of the staff members have experience | 0 |

| 6) Program promotion of litter reduction and/or recycling | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) Very well explained, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Brief explanation, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not explained | 1 |
| d) No explanation of a litter reduction program | 0 |

Recycling

| 1) How well are the project and accomplishments described? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Describe well, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Described fairly well, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not defined | 1 |
| d) No description of project and/or accomplishments given | 0 |

| 2) Does the timeline list specific tasks, milestone dates and accomplishments during the year? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) No clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Missing some milestone dates, few tasks listed, accomplishments not mentioned | 1 |
| d) No timelines, no tasks listed, no accomplishments listed | 0 |

| 3) Is the service area defined? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Very well defined, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Defined, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not defined | 1 |
| d) No service area given | 0 |

| 4) Are the project's benefits for service area and/or targeted group defined? | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) Very well defined, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Defined, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not defined | 1 |
| d) Project's benefits for service area and/or targeted group are not defined | 0 |

| 5) Is the need for this project described? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Very well defined, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Defined, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not defined | 1 |
| d) Project need was not determined | 0 |

| 6) Does the applicant provide a mechanism to measure/analyze project effectiveness? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Mechanism gives measured quality results, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Mechanism does not accurately measure/analyze program effectiveness; revision/clarification needed but data gathered | 3 |
| c) Mechanism to measure/analyze project effectiveness does not measure and/or analyze project effectiveness | 1 |
| d) No mechanism to measure/analyze project effectiveness used | 0 |

| 7) Explain how your project/program will achieve demonstrable direct results | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Easily understood and relatable, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Understood and relatable, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but no explanation given | 1 |
| d) No explanation for achieving demonstrable results given | 0 |

Recycling (cont.)

| 8) Are there other providers or entities that provide similar services as this project? If so, please explain how this project is different. | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Explanation is easily understood and relatable, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Explanation is understandable and relatable, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Other providers mentioned, but no explanation for the project difference | 1 |
| d) No explanation about providers of same service or project differences | 0 |

| 9) Possibility of project partners/potential for partnership(s) | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) Very well explained, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Brief explanation, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned, not explained | 1 |
| d) No explanation for potential partnerships is given | 0 |

| 10) Project continuation after funding has ended | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) Very well explained, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Brief explanation, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not explained | 1 |
| d) No explanation for project continuation after funding has ended | 0 |

| 11) Does the program promote end-markets for recycled materials and/or purchase of products made of recycled materials? | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) Very well explained, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Brief explanation, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not explained | 1 |
| d) No explanation | 0 |

| 12) Does the program create end-use markets for recyclables in Nebraska? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Very well explained, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Brief explanation, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not explained | 1 |
| d) No explanation | 0 |

| 13) Does the program increase the value or marketability of the recycled materials? | Points |
|--|---------------|
| a) Very well explained, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Brief explanation, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not explained | 1 |
| d) No explanation | 0 |

| 14) Is the market for recyclables collected or processed identified? | Points |
|---|---------------|
| a) Very well explained, no clarification needed | 5 |
| b) Brief explanation, some clarification needed | 3 |
| c) Mentioned but not explained | 1 |
| d) No explanation | 0 |

Recycling (cont.)

Cash Match / In-Kind Match

A **Cash Match** is when goods or services are paid by your organization with funds other than grant funds.

An **In-Kind Match** (Non-cash Match) is when goods or services are paid by a 3rd party such as a person / city / organization outside of your organization – usually includes volunteers.

Ranking Points:

| | |
|-------------|-----------|
| 50% to 100% | 10 points |
| 25% to 49% | 5 points |
| 0% to 24% | 0 points |