

ICE Spot

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>4</u>	5	<u>20</u>
(1-5) <u>5</u>	5	<u>25</u>
(1-5) <u>5</u>	2	<u>10</u>
(1-5) <u>4</u>	1	<u>4</u>
(1-5) <u>1</u>	2	<u>3</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:

62

Add Preference Points

0-10

10

Shoulder Season -- before June and after September

0-10

5

Outlying Areas

0-10

4

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

0-10

4

Family Friendliness

23

Deduct Penalty Points

-10

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

TOTAL POINTS

85

TRAVEL

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments:

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO

Partial funding: \$ 4000

Ice Sports

K MARQUEZ

Name of Applicant

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>4</u>	2	<u>8</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	1	<u>3</u>
(1-5) <u>2</u>	2	<u>4</u>

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

Excellent, but relatively small, event

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?

Budget for marketing seems enormous compared to total # of visitors.

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

yes. But they are more to value of KIS than to tourism.

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:

35

Add Preference Points

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

participants, not visitors

Deduct Penalty Points

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

TOTAL POINTS

~~35~~ 57

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments: Not a strong tourism draw. Could reach likely out of towners via outreach to skaters. Posters, e-mail blasts, personal direct invitations to skating clubs in region should be effective and cost-effective.

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

K- Ice Sports

Name of Applicant

CHIP

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>20</u>
(1-5) <u>5</u>	5	<u>25</u>
(1-5) <u>4</u>	2	<u>8</u>
(1-5) <u>4</u>	1	<u>4</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:

63

Add Preference Points

0-10

10

Shoulder Season – before June and after September

0-10

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

88

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments:

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO

Partial funding: \$

2500.00 towards

OUT OF AREA
PRINT ADS

Klamath Ice Sports
Name of Applicant

Deanne He Tetama
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>4</u>	1	<u>5</u>	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.
(1-5) <u>3</u>	2	<u>5</u>	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?
SUB-TOTAL POINTS:		<u>35</u>	
<u>Add Preference Points</u>			
0-10		<u>8</u>	Shoulder Season – before June and after September
0-10		<u>0</u>	Outlying Areas
0-10		<u>8</u>	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10		<u>7</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>58</u>	

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments: Strong community support - annual event; traceable ticket sales online prove tourism potential.

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 5,000

100

Name of Applicant

Klamath Ice Sports Inc.
1001 N. Eugene Skating Spectacular

Name of Reviewer

B Sullivan

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

10,000 Req
150 pages

Score	Weight	Points
(1-5) <u>3</u>	5	<u>15</u>
(1-5) <u>4</u>	5	<u>20</u>
(1-5) <u>4</u>	2	<u>8</u>
(1-5) <u>4</u>	1	<u>4</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	2	<u>6</u>
SUB-TOTAL POINTS:		<u>53</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?

Add Preference Points

0-10	<u>6</u>
0-10	<u>4</u>
0-10	<u>5</u>
0-10	<u>10</u>

Shoulder Season – before June and after September February 3 = 6
Outlying Areas
Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure 5
Family Friendliness

Deduct Penalty Points

-10 0

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

TOTAL POINTS

78

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments:

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

Ans.
3750.00