

SledDog
Name of Applicant

Amber
Name of Reviewer

Fall 2011_Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

Score	Weight	Points
(1-5) <u>2</u>	5	<u>10</u>
(1-5) <u>2</u>	5	<u>10</u>
(1-5) <u>2</u>	2	<u>4</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	1	<u>3</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	2	<u>6</u>

How well does/will this project increase tourism?
Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?

Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project?
Is the budget and plan realistic?
What is the potential to succeed?
Is management and/or administration capable?

Is there demonstrated community support?
Is there evidence of in-kind support?
Are there endorsements by community groups?

Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive?
Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.

Is there a strong evaluation method?
How will the applicant document the impact?
Are the outcomes measurable and objective?

SUB-TOTAL POINTS: 23

Add Preference Points

0-10	<u>5</u>	Shoulder Season – before June and after September
0-10	<u>5</u>	Outlying Areas
0-10	<u>1</u>	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10	<u>2</u>	Family Friendliness
	<u>12</u>	

Deduct Penalty Points

-10 _____ Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time

TOTAL POINTS 35

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments: _____

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 2000

Chemult Sheel Dog

Name of Applicant

K. MARQUEZ

Name of Reviewer

Fall 2011 Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

Score Weight Points

(1-5) 3 5 15

How well does/will this project increase tourism?
Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?

(1-5) 3 5 15

Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project?
Is the budget and plan realistic?
What is the potential to succeed?
Is management and/or administration capable?

(1-5) 1 2 2

Is there demonstrated community support? *I would prefer to see*
Is there evidence of in-kind support? *some Chemult \$ support.*
Are there endorsements by community groups? *\$700 from wrinkledog.*

(1-5) 4 1 4

Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive?
Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.

(1-5) 4 2 8

Is there a strong evaluation method?
How will the applicant document the impact?
Are the outcomes measurable and objective?

SUB-TOTAL POINTS: 44

Add Preference Points

0-10 10

Shoulder Season – before June and after September

0-10 10

Outlying Areas

0-10 5

Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure

0-10 10

Family Friendliness

Deduct Penalty Points

-10 _____

Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time

TOTAL POINTS 79

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments: Much better plan and proposal than this group has submitted
in the past. I would like to see Chemult contributing to this
~~prop~~ effort w/ some dollars. Partial funding best.

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 2,000

Charmelle Snow Doe RACUS
Name of Applicant

CHRP
Name of Reviewer

Fall 2011 Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

Score	Weight	Points	
(1-5) <u>3</u>	5	<u>15</u>	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?
(1-5) <u>5</u>	5	<u>25</u>	Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project? Is the budget and plan realistic? What is the potential to succeed? Is management and/or administration capable?
(1-5) <u>1</u>	2	<u>2</u>	Is there demonstrated community support? Is there evidence of in-kind support? Are there endorsements by community groups?
(1-5) <u>5</u>	1	<u>5</u>	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.
(1-5) <u>5</u>	2	<u>10</u>	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?
SUB-TOTAL POINTS:		<u>57</u>	
<u>Add Preference Points</u>			
0-10		<u>10</u>	Shoulder Season – before June and after September
0-10		<u>10</u>	Outlying Areas
0-10		<u>5</u>	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10		<u>10</u>	Family Friendliness
<u>Deduct Penalty Points</u>			
-10		_____	Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
TOTAL POINTS		<u>92</u>	

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments: _____

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 3000.00

Chemult Dog Sled Races
Name of Applicant

Devinell Tehara
Name of Reviewer

Fall 2011 Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

Score	Weight	Points	
(1-5) <u>1</u>	5	<u>6</u>	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?
(1-5) <u>3</u>	5	<u>8</u>	Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project? - which project? Is the budget and plan realistic? What is the potential to succeed? Is management and/or administration capable?
(1-5) <u>3</u>	2	<u>5</u>	Is there demonstrated community support? Is there evidence of in-kind support? Are there endorsements by community groups?
(1-5) <u>1</u>	1	<u>2</u>	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.
(1-5) <u>1</u>	2	<u>3</u>	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?

SUB-TOTAL POINTS: 29

Add Preference Points

0-10	<u>8</u>	Shoulder Season – before June and after September
0-10	<u>8</u>	Outlying Areas
0-10	<u>0</u>	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10	<u>3</u>	Family Friendliness

Deduct Penalty Points

-10 _____ Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time

TOTAL POINTS 43

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments: Specifically states they do not plan on promoting outside the county
This proposal seems like funds for a marketing campaign/partnership

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: ~~0~~

Name of Applicant

Shelby County, Kansas

Name of Reviewer

*B. Sullivan
\$7,000 Req*

Fall 2011 Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

Score	Weight	Points
(1-5) <u>3</u>	5	<u>15</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	5	<u>15</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	2	<u>6</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	1	<u>3</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	2	<u>6</u>
SUB-TOTAL POINTS:		<u>45</u>

How well does/will this project increase tourism? *Advancing*
Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits? *Y*

Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project? *Y*
Is the budget and plan realistic? *Y*
What is the potential to succeed? *Good*
Is management and/or administration capable? *Y*

Is there demonstrated community support? *Y*
Is there evidence of in-kind support? *Y*
Are there endorsements by community groups? *Y*

Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? *Y*
Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.

Is there a strong evaluation method? *Attendance*
How will the applicant document the impact? *"*
Are the outcomes measurable and objective? *Good*

Add Preference Points

0-10	<u>8</u>	Shoulder Season -- before June and after September
0-10	<u>5</u>	Outlying Areas
0-10	<u>5</u>	Length of Stay -- encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10	<u>5</u>	Family Friendliness

Deduct Penalty Points

-10	<u>0</u>	Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
-----	----------	---

TOTAL POINTS

68

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments:

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 3,000.00

MS \$2,000.00