SWED Dog Name of Applicant Name of Reviewer

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

Score	Weight	Points	
(1-5) <u>5</u>	5	205	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)	2	<u>81</u>	Is there demonstrated community support? Is there evidence of in-kind support? Are there endorsements by community groups?
(1-5) _4	1	<u>-4.</u>	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.
(1-5)	2	_8/_	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?
SUB-TOTAL P	OINTS:	14	
Add Preferenc	e Points		
0-10		<u> </u>	Shoulder Season – before June and after September
0-10			Outlying Areas
0-10		10	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10			Family Friendliness 27
Deduct Penalty	/ Points		9'
	-10	#	Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
TOTAL POINT	'S	<u> 97</u>	_
Reviewer Co	nflict of Inter	est:	
Comments:			
6			A
Do you recom	mend this pro	ject for funding:	YES □ NO Partial funding: \$ 7500

National Shepdon Knah

Name of Reviewer

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

Score	Weight	Points	
(1-5) 3	5	<u>15</u>	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?
(1-5) 5	5	<u>as</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) 5	2	10	Is there demonstrated community support? Is there evidence of in-kind support? Are there endorsements by community groups?
(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 P	OINTS:	62	
Add Preferenc	e Points		
0-10		<u>3</u>	Shoulder Season – before June and after September
0-10		_5_	Outlying Areas
0-10		7	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10		_8	Family Friendliness
Deduct Penalty	y Points	_	
	-10	<u>23</u>	Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
TOTAL POINT	rs	85	-
Reviewer Co	nflict of Inter	·est:	
Comments:			
			# 10
Do you recom	mend this pro	ject for funding:	YES D NO Partial funding: \$ 10,000

Form # KCF 3008 Revised the 28th of September, 2011

Short	0d04
Name of Applicant	

MARQUEZ Property of Reviewer

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

Score	Weight	Points	
(1-5) 5	5	25	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?
(1-5) _5_	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)	2	10	Is there demonstrated community support? Is there evidence of in-kind support? Are there endorsements by community groups?
(1-5) _5	1	_5_	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.
(1-5)	2	10	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?
SUB-TOTAL PO	INTS:	75	
Add Preference	<u>Points</u>		
0-10			Shoulder Season – before June and after September
0-10		10	Outlying Areas
0-10		10	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10		10	Family Friendliness
Deduct Penalty	<u>Points</u>		
-1	0		Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
TOTAL POINTS		165	
Reviewer Con	flict of Intere	est:	
Comments: S	superb ur co	event. unty: 1	Great Fourism draw. Signature event Highest recommendation !! ilorally sanctioned event.
		_	1/2 500
Do you recomm	end this proj	ect for funding: I	YES □ NO Partial funding: \$

Form # KCF 3008 Revised the 28th of September, 2011 NAK'L SHELD DOG FINALS

CI) IP MASSIE

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

			(Tourish Francis Goding)
Score	Weight	Points	
(1-5)	5	11	How well does/will this project increase tourism? HISTORILACLY NOT SUTCELL Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?
(1-5)	5	<u>V</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)	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)	2	8	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?
SUB-TOTAL P	OINTS:	<u> 59</u>	
Add Preferenc	e Points		
0-10		5	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		<u></u>	Family Friendliness
Deduct Penalty	y Points		
	-10		Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
TOTAL POINT	's	84	_
Reviewer Co	nflict of Inter	est:	
đ	la boo	7	1 Process 2 War and Comment

P. A. DISTALIBUTED: NOT LYN

THIS CROUP NEEDS HELP FOLUSING

Form # KCF 3008 Revised the 28th of September, 2011 Name of Applicant 2012- Doctorel, Storpe of Free,

Name of Reviewer B. Salkusa.

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

Score	Weight	<u>Points</u>	
(1-5) 4	5	20	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?
(1-5) <u>ડ</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) 5	2 .	10	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.
(1-5) <u>5</u>	1	5	Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.
(1-5)	2	<u> </u>	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact? Are the outcomes measurable and objective?
SUB-TOTAL P	OINTS:	68	, and the second
Add Preference	e Points		
0-10		_8_	Shoulder Season – before June and after September
0-10		_/0	Outlying Areas
0-10		10	Length of Stay – encourage early arrival and/or late departure
0-10		10	Family Friendliness
Deduct Penalty	/ Points		
	-10	8	Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time
TOTAL POINT	s	106	-

Reviewer Conflict of Interest:

Comments:

\$ 10,000 00?

Do you recommend this project for funding:

Yes □ NO Partial funding: \$

4500 + 10,000 " 2,22 per visitor

Form # KCF 3008 Revised the 28th of September, 2011

Natival Social Name of Applicant	<u>dq</u>	Name of Reviewer	
		Spring 2012_Tourism Grant Application Selection Criteria Summary (Tourism Review Panel scoring)	
Score Weight	Points		
(1-5) 5	20	How well does/will this project increase tourism? Will it encourage longer-term or repeat visits?	
(1-5) 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) 2	8	·	
(1-5) 2	<u> </u>	Is there demonstrated community support? Is there evidence of in-kind support?	
<u></u>		Are there endorsements by community groups?	
(1-5) 1		Is the presentation clear, concise and attractive? Points will be deducted for vague or rambling responses.	
(1-5)2	10	Is there a strong evaluation method? How will the applicant document the impact?	
	15	Are the outcomes measurable and objective?	
SUB-TOTAL POINTS:			
Add Preference Points	0		
0-10	8	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		
0-10	<u>V</u>	Family Friendliness	
Deduct Penalty Points			
-10		Previous tourism projects not completed on time or final evaluation not submitted on time	
TOTAL POINTS	99_	-	
Reviewer Conflict of Interes	it:		
Comment In C 1	2 00	Doiet B 1000 OS Communita	
Commentat, Mar of Contract of			
* National acres good exposed for area			
* rotate hack to couldty in 3 cass			
Do you recommend this project for funding: A YES D NO Partial funding:			
Form # KCF 3008 Revised the 28 th of Septen			
Utangen His to or gabrai	INVITATE I		