

Audubon
Name of Applicant

AMBERS
Name of Reviewer

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

Score	Weight	Points	
(1-5) <u>5</u>	5	<u>25</u>	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?
(1-5) <u>4</u>	5	<u>20</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>4</u>	2	<u>8</u>	Is there demonstrated community support? Is there evidence of in-kind support? Are there endorsements by community groups?
(1-5) <u>4</u>	1	<u>4</u>	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.
(1-5) <u>4</u>	2	<u>8</u>	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?
SUB-TOTAL POINTS:		<u>65</u>	
<u>Add Preference Points</u>			
0-10		<u>6</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
		<u>21</u>	
<u>Deduct Penalty Points</u>			
-10		<u>86</u>	Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
TOTAL POINTS		<u>86</u>	

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments: _____

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 5000.00

Klamath Basin Audubon
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) <u>5</u>	5	<u>25</u>	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits? <i>Excellent event w/ documented record of bringing visitors.</i>
(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? <i>yes.</i>
(1-5) <u>5</u>	2	<u>10</u>	Is there demonstrated community support? Is there evidence of in-kind support? Are there endorsements by community groups? <i>yes. letters.</i>
(1-5) <u>4</u>	1	<u>4</u>	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses. <i>could use more on pull.</i>
(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? <i>yes. registration makes this easy.</i>

SUB-TOTAL POINTS: 64

Add Preference Points

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

Deduct Penalty Points

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

TOTAL POINTS 104

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments: If we had more dollars, I'd recommend full funding. 482 room nights last year.

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 8,000

William Wicks
Name of Applicant

CAIP
Name of Reviewer

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

Score	Weight	Points	
(1-5) <u>5</u>	5	<u>25</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>5</u>	2	<u>10</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>75</u>	
<u>Add Preference Points</u>			
0-10		<u>10</u>	Shoulder Season – before June and after September
0-10		<u> </u>	Outlying Areas
0-10		<u>10</u>	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10		<u>5</u>	Family Friendliness
<u>Deduct Penalty Points</u>			
-10		<u> </u>	Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
TOTAL POINTS		<u>100</u>	

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments: _____

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

Hannah Boin Auderbar
Name of Applicant

Deannele Lehama
Name of Reviewer

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

Score	Weight	Points	
(1-5) <u>4</u>	5	<u>9</u>	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?
(1-5) <u>4</u>	5	<u>9</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>5</u>	2	<u>7</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>6</u>	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.
(1-5) <u>4</u>	2	<u>6</u>	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?
SUB-TOTAL POINTS:		<u>37</u>	
<u>Add Preference Points</u>			
0-10		<u>10</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
<u>Deduct Penalty Points</u>			
-10		_____	Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
TOTAL POINTS		<u>62</u>	

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments: Well attended + supported every year. Travel to outlying areas a plus. Guided as well as non-guided attracts both professionals + novice. All ages + levels.

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 37,000

Name of Applicant

Name of Reviewer

Klamath Basin Audubon Society
Winter Wimp Festival

B. Sullivan

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

10,000.00
600 pages
1000-1300 words

Score	Weight	Points
(1-5) <u>4</u>	5	<u>20</u>
(1-5) <u>5</u>	5	<u>25</u>
(1-5) <u>4</u>	2	<u>8</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	1	<u>3</u>
(1-5) <u>4</u>	2	<u>8</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: 59

Add Preference Points

0-10	<u>8</u>	Shoulder Season – before June and after September 2-16 thru Sunday 10 th
0-10	<u>8</u>	Outlying Areas
0-10	<u>8</u>	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure 4 days
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 88

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments:

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial-funding: \$ 10,000.00 - Full Funding

WS
8000.00