

**FFY-2019 ARC GRANT APPLICATION REVIEW RECORD**

LDD Project ID#: _____			
<b>PROJECT:</b> _____			
<b>SPONSOR:</b> _____			
<b>BUDGET:</b>	ARC	\$ _____	DOS / LDD Reviewer: _____
	Other Fed.	\$ _____	
	State	\$ _____	Basic Agency: _____
	Local Cash	\$ _____	
	Local In-Kind	\$ _____	<i>(if applicable)</i>
	Other	\$ _____	
	<b>TOTAL</b>	\$ _____	
<b>ARC GOAL:</b> _____ <b>NYS STRATEGY:</b> _____			

**Grades Assigned**

<u>Scoring Category</u>	<u>Max%</u>	<u>Score for Category</u>
<b>A. Contribution to Area Development</b>	<b>(40%)</b>	_____
<b>B. Project Feasibility</b>	<b>(40%)</b>	_____
<b>C. Sponsor's Need / Relevance of ARC Funds</b>	<b>(20%)</b>	_____
<b><u>/ Accuracy &amp; Timeliness</u></b>		
	<b><u>Total:</u></b>	_____

**Grading Guidance:**

Credit for each sub-category may be given in 1/5<sup>th</sup> increments (i.e., 5 pt. sub-categories may earn 5, 4, 3, 2, 1, or 0 pts; 10 pt. sub-categories may earn 10, 8, 6, 4, 2, or 0 pts; etc.)

- 5/5ths x total subcategory points: Completely, effectively and efficiently satisfies all subcategory criteria.
- 4/5ths x total subcategory points: Moderately high compliance with subcategory criteria.
- 3/5ths x total subcategory points: Moderate compliance with desired criteria.
- 2/5ths x total subcategory points: Moderately low compliance to criteria.
- 1/5ths x total subcategory points: Low match to subcategory criteria.
- 0/5ths x total subcategory points: Little or no relationship between project and subcategory criteria.

**A. Contribution to Area Development (40%)**

1. **Demonstrated Area Need: (15 pts)**

**Score: 15 / 12 / 9 / 6 / 3 / 0**

- a. Does this project address a problem or need that can be well-addressed by a NYS Implementing Strategy?
- b. Is the proposed project relevant to the ARC Strategic Plan and appropriate for ARC funding?
- c. Will the proposed project implement a program identified in the REDC Strategy and / or the LDD's CEDS?
- d. If not, will the proposed project implement a program identified in a regional, county, or other comprehensive plan?
- e. What other formal community documents have identified a need for the proposed project?
- f. Is there other widespread support from the civic or business community for this project? Is it documented?

2. **Outcomes / Outputs / Regional Significance: (15 pts)**

**Score: 15 / 12 / 9 / 6 / 3 / 0**

- a. Are the projected outputs / outcomes significant?
- b. Do the projected outputs / outcomes represent a "good value" for ARC's investment? (This is a subjective evaluation of costs vs. benefit compared to other alternative projects.)
- c. Does the project significantly implement a NYS strategy and contribute toward an ARC Investment Goal?
- d. How much additional economic benefit from public and private resources will be generated for the community / region after completion of the proposed project?

3. **Sustainability: (10 pts)**

**Score: 10 / 8 / 6 / 4 / 2 / 0**

- a. Is the project fully sustainable? Is it effective as a standalone accomplishment? Will it be perpetuated by a committed sponsor that does not require any speculative additional sources of funding in the future?
- b. If not fully committed, is the projected source of future sustaining funds reputable and significantly credible?

**B. Project Feasibility (40%)**

1. **Workplan & Timeline: (5 pts)**

**Score: 5 / 4 / 3 / 2 / 1 / 0**

- a. Is the workplan clearly and concisely explained? Is it feasible?
- b. Is the timeline diagram consistent with the workplan? Is it feasible?
- c. Is the proposal the best approach for NYS's Implementing Strategy and for the region / LDD?

2. **Uses and Sources of Funds: (5pts)**

**Score: 5 / 4 / 3 / 2 / 1 / 0**

- a. What are the "uses" of ARC and other agency funds? Is it clear what the funds will be used for? How they contribute to the community's "need"? Are they appropriate for the program?
- b. Are the sources of funds clearly identified, well-documented, and committed?
- c. Unconfirmed funds: If some matching funds are unconfirmed, has the applicant addressed the gap by providing details about the status of the funding, a date such funding was requested, and an anticipated date by when the funding commitment will be finalized?

3. **Budget Evaluation: (5 pts)**

**Score: 5 / 4 / 3 / 2 / 1 / 0**

- a. Are all budget presentations consistent and well explained?
- b. If in-kind resources are used to match the project, are they justified by appropriate documentation and explanations and consistent with known standards?

4. **Project Sponsor's Capability and Reputation: (10 pts)** **Score: 10 / 8 / 6 / 4 / 2 / 0**

(This is a subjective evaluation sub-category.)

- a. Graders should evaluate the sponsor's capability to execute the contract on time and on budget.
- b. Graders should evaluate the project partners' capabilities to complete their portion of the proposal as necessary to effectively complete the requirements of the project.

5. **Prerequisites in Place: (5 pts)** **Score: 5 / 4 / 3 / 2 / 1 / 0**

- a. If a Basic Agency (BA) is needed to administer a project with a significant construction component, is a signed BA letter submitted with the application?
- b. If a municipal board resolution is needed, it is appropriately certified and included with the application?
- c. All commitments are documented and included with the application.
- d. If the proposed project will affect expansion of sewer or water lines or roadways, or otherwise affect local development, a DOS Smart Growth Review should be initiated.

6. **All Other Relevant Documentation Included: (5 pts)** **Score: 5 / 4 / 3 / 2 / 1 / 0**

(To include materials indicating ongoing community support that will see the project to completion and beyond, and other documents reflecting on the appropriateness and/or sustainability of the project.)

- a. Additional documentation must include required support letters from any project partners, board resolutions from municipalities, and should include community support letters from appropriate officials and business community and affected civic organizations.
- b. Any maps, vendor materials, and engineering documentation that may be required; Must be CONCISE, LEGIBLE when duplicated in black and white print, and relevant. (Significant reference documentation may be submitted by a virus-scanned thumb drive or disk.)

7. **REDC Support: (5 pts)** **Score: 5 / 4 / 3 / 2 / 1 / 0**

- a. Ideally, a member of the applicable REDC has cited the applicability of the project to the current REDC strategy, or expressed confirmation that the project is "consistent" with the objectives of the REDC;
- b. If the proposed project is not related to any of the REDC's objectives or strategies, but is important to area development, some indication of REDC support would still be helpful.

**C. Sponsor's Need / Relevance of ARC Funds / Application Accuracy & Timeliness (20%)**

1. **Sponsor's Need: (5 pts)** **Score: 5 / 4 / 3 / 2 / 1 / 0**

- a. Has the sponsor availed itself of all potential resources? Is the ARC's contribution the last and best resource available for this project and this sponsor?
- b. If the sponsor is financially well-off, explain to the satisfaction of the graders why ARC program is needed and why self-financing is impractical or why other benefactors are not viable for this project.

2. **Relevance / Significance of ARC Funds: (5 pts)** **Score: 5 / 4 / 3 / 2 / 1 / 0**

- a. Will the ARC's contribution be materially significant? (I.e., if the sponsor can fund a significant portion of the project through outside resources, can ARC funding be justified as having a significant impact on the overall project?)
- b. If ARC funding were unavailable, could the project's proposed outcomes be achieved with other available resources? If yes, are the reasons why ARC should support this project explained?

3. **Completeness, Accuracy, and Timeliness of the Application: (10 pts)** **Score: 10 / 8 / 6 / 4 / 2 / 0**

- a. Has the sponsor thoroughly and accurately completed the application, including all required, and concisely answered all questions asked in the application narrative?
- b. (This is a subjective evaluation.)

DRAFT