

FUNDING APPLICATION SCORING RUBRIC

Revised October 1, 2025

RANKING OVERVIEW

- 85–100 points: Strongly recommended for funding.
- 70–84 points: Recommended, pending available funds.
- 50–69 points: Consider if funds remain, but application needs improvement.
- Below 50 points: Not recommended.

ESTIMATED WATER SAVINGS (0-25 POINTS)

- High (21–25): Clear, well-supported estimate of significant water savings relative to system size; includes credible data sources or calculations.
- Medium (11–20): Provides some estimate of water savings; moderate supporting detail; may rely on assumptions without strong data.
- Low (1–10): Vague or minimal savings described; little to no supporting data.

PROJECT JUSTIFICATION (0-45 POINTS)

- High (36–45): Strong case for need; references audits, pilot projects, inefficiencies, or research; clear link to water conservation/optimization goals; outlines specific ways AMI will reduce loss or improve efficiency.
- Medium (21–35): Provides a reasonable case but lacks depth in supporting evidence; some discussion of benefits but not fully connected to conservation goals.
- Low (1–20): General justification with little to no evidence; unclear link to conservation or efficiency outcomes.

PROJECT BUDGET (0-30 POINTS)

- High (25–30): Detailed, itemized budget with hardware, quantities, and reasonable cost estimates; aligns with eligible expenses; clearly demonstrates match funding.
- Medium (11–24): Budget provided but may be missing detail (e.g., incomplete itemization, unclear costs); generally aligns with program but has gaps.
- Low (1–10): Minimal or unclear budget information; may include ineligible costs; lacks evidence of cost realism.

