

WESTERN RAILROAD
Name of Applicant

Don
Name of Reviewer

Spring 2012 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) 2 5 10

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) 3 2 6

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

(1-5) 1 3

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

(1-5) 2 2 4

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

SUB-TOTAL POINTS: 38

Add Preference Points

0-10 5

Shoulder Season -- before June and after September

0-10 5

Outlying Areas

0-10 5

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

0-10 5

Family Friendliness

20

Deduct Penalty Points

-10

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

TOTAL POINTS 58

Reviewer Conflict of Interest: _____

Comments: _____

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO Partial funding: \$ 1000

Klamath & Western R.R

Name of Applicant

Lisa Tallman

Name of Reviewer

Spring 2012 Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

\$2,000⁰⁰

Score Weight Points

(1-5) 2 5 10

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

(1-5) 2 5 10

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) 2 2 4

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

(1-5) 2 1 2

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

(1-5) 2 2 4

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

SUB-TOTAL POINTS: 30

Add Preference Points

0-10 0

Shoulder Season – before June and after September

0-10 0

Outlying Areas

0-10 0

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

0-10 10

Family Friendliness

Deduct Penalty Points

-10 0

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

TOTAL POINTS 40

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments:

Do you recommend this project for funding: YES NO

Partial funding: \$ 2,000⁰⁰

K1. Railroad

MARQUEZ

Name of Applicant

Name of Reviewer

Spring 2012_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>

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:

45

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>5</u>	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10	<u>5</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

60

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments: Sound project. I would like to see design. Encourage
work closely w/ DR we design/distribution.
shall directly contact railroad enthusiasts; hobbyists.
\$2,000 Train mtn.

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

Ki W RAILROAD INC.

Name of Applicant

CHIP MASSIE

Name of Reviewer

Spring 2012_Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

Score Weight Points

(1-5) 2 5 10

How well does/will this project increase tourism? CASE NOT MADE EFFECTIVE
Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits? HOW WILL BROCHURE BE

(1-5) 3 5 15

Does the applicant have the ability to complete the project? DELIVERED?
Is the budget and plan realistic?

What is the potential to succeed?
Is management and/or administration capable? NOT SURE

(1-5) 3 2 6

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

(1-5) 3 1 3

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

(1-5) 3 2 6

Is there a strong evaluation method? NOT SO MUCH
How will the applicant document the impact?
Are the outcomes measurable and objective?

SUB-TOTAL POINTS: 50

Add Preference Points

0-10 3 Shoulder Season – before June and after September

0-10 10 Outlying Areas

0-10 1 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 74

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments: \$2000 HOW DID THEY ARRIVE AT OUT OF AREA VISITOR COUNT?
WITH SOME DIRECTION REGARDING DATA GATHERING AND DISTRIBUTION,
SEEMS TO BE MOSTLY FOCUSED ON IN COUNTY MARKETING

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

2000.00

Name of Applicant Winnipeg - Winton 200
Full Color Brochure

Name of Reviewer B Sullivan

Spring 2012 Tourism Grant Application
Selection Criteria Summary
(Tourism Review Panel scoring)

101 ✓

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>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>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>3</u>	2	<u>6</u>	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?

Everything is perfect

SUB-TOTAL POINTS: 56

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>5</u>	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10	<u>10</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 91

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments: \$2,000.00 5500 + 2,000.00
1000 per visitor

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

KW Railroad
Name of Applicant

Danville Thomas
Name of Reviewer

Spring 2012 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>4</u>	5	<u>20</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	2	<u>6</u>
(1-5) <u>3</u>	1	<u>3</u>
(1-5) <u>2</u>	2	<u>4</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?

Sub-TOTAL POINTS:

Add Preference Points

0-10	<u>6</u>
0-10	<u>2</u>
0-10	<u>2</u>
0-10	<u>5</u>

Shoulder Season – before June and after September

Outlying Areas

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

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: Needs more defined way to track analytics - would like to see support from proposed partners

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