|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| This rubric is designed to be a reference for PreservINg Scoring Committee members as they review and score applications. The range of scores provided are benchmarks so members can choose a score that accurately reflects the details provided in each unique application. During scoring committee meetings, members will come to a consensus on the final score based on this rubric. Supporting documentation should always clearly support statements made, be easy to read/interpret, and easy to find/identify within the application (page cites). | | | |
| Project History | | | |
| Main Street District History | | | |
| Is there a detailed easy to understand project history? | 0  The description is not easy to understand, details are limited, and it is hard to follow the historic timeline. No research has been done. | 5  The description is easy to understand, some details are included. Timeline can be followed, and some historical research has been done. | 10  The description is detailed and easy to understand. Reviewers can easily understand the history of the district and research has been done. |
| Are there clear historical factors being addressed that connect to project need? | 0  There are no historical factors that connect to project need. | 5  There are some historical factors that connect to project need and description is somewhat clear. | 10  A number of historical factors connect to project need and the description is clear. |
| Historic Preservation Community History | | | |
| Has the community participated in any historic preservation planning previously? | 0  The community has not participated in any previous historic preservation planning. | 5  The community has participated in some previous historic preservation planning but has stalled in efforts. | 10  The community has done previous historic preservation planning and are working towards next steps. |
| Does the community have a National Register District that correlates with the Main Street District? | 0  No National Register district documents were uploaded. | 5  National Register documents were uploaded but they do not fully coordinate with the Main Street district. | 10  The National Register documents were uploaded and the NR district and Main Street district overlap. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Community Development** | | | |
| **Community benefits** | | | |
| Will this program have any community impact? | 0  Community impact has not been explained. | 5  Community impact is explained by details are lacking. | 10  Community impact is fully explained with details. |
| **Community Historic Preservation** | | | |
| Is the community’s approach to historic preservation being addressed? | 0  The community’s approach to historic preservation has not been explained. | 5  The community approach to historic preservation has been somewhat explained but details are missing. | 10  The community’s approach to historic preservation has been explained with details. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Need** | | | |
|  | | | |
| Is there need for the program based on vacancy rate? | 0  Vacancy rate is not explained. | 10  Vacancy rate is somewhat explained with some detail on factors that led to the rate. | 20  Vacancy rate and factors that led to this rate have been explained in detail. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Goals** | | | |
|  | | | |
| Does the program fit into the Main Street organization’s goals, workplan, and mission statement? | 0  The correlation between Main Street and the PreservINg program have not been explained and/or proven. | 5  The correlation between Main Street and the PreservINg program have been somewhat explained but details may be missing, or the connection is not strong. | 10  The correlation between Main Street and the PreservINg program have been explained and proven in detail. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Partnerships** | | | | |
| **Project Partners** | | | | |
| Does the project have identified partners with specific roles? | 0  There are no identified partners. | 10  The only identified partners are those that are required through the program, or the roles of the partners have not been explained. | | 20  The identified partners are made up of a variety of community members and organizations and their roles have been explained in detail. |
| Have the project teams been established for the project? | 0  No project teams were identified. | 10  Project teams were identified but may be lacking in either members or member information. | | 20  Project teams were identified with the right number of members and information. |
| **Partner Experience** | | | | |
| Do the project team members have experience in their identified team areas? | 0  No experience or qualifications were documented. | 10  The project teams have minimum experience or summary lacks detail. | 20  The project teams have experience, and a detailed summary was included. | |
| Does the Main Street organization have experience working with building and business owners? | 0  The Main Street organization has no experience with working with building or business owners or no explanation provided. | 10  The Main Street organization has some experience working the building and business owners. | 20  The Main Street organization has extensive experience working with business and building owners. | |
| **Partner recruitment** | | | | |
| What is the Main Street organization’s strategy for recruiting business owners into the program. | 0  No explanation was provided. | 10  The Main Street organization has a strategy for recruiting building owners, but some details are lacking. | 20  The Main Street organization has a strategy with details for recruiting building owners. | |
| Does the application include 8-10 letters of support from building owners? | 0  No support letters were provided. | 10  Less than 8 letters were provided an/or details were missing on the property connected to the owners. | 20  8-10 letters of support were provided by building owners with their property addresses. | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Financials** | | | |
| **Local Unit of Government commitment** | | | |
| Was a resolution of support provided by the LUG? | 0  No resolution of support was provided. | 5  A resolution was supplied however it does not indicate that the LUG will pay for the planning project. | 10  A resolution was provided that shows that the LUG will pay for the planning of the project. |
| Did the clerk-treasurer provide information on where the planning grant funds are coming from? | 0  No information was provided. | 5  Information was provided but it is unclear what funding account is being used. | 10  A letter was provided and clearly indicates the funding source for the project planning and design. |
| Was a resolution of support by the board of directors provided? | 0  No resolution was provided. | 5  A resolution was provided but it was not signed by 100% of board members and/or does not indicate they will raise the required $100,000. | 10  A resolution was provided and signed by 100% of board members and indicated they will raise $100,000. |
| Are the current financial incentives for community explained? | 0  No information was provided. | 5  The community does not have any financial incentives or information was missing explaining the current financial incentives. | 10  The community has current financial incentives and a detailed explanation of how successful they have been provided. |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Current Conditions** | | | |
| Is the current municipal approval process for construction projects in the downtown district explained? | 0  No information was provided. | 5  The current municipal approval process is explained but details are missing. | 10  The current municipal approval process was explained with details. |
| Are the current conditions of the Main Street district building explained? | 0  No information was provided. | 5  The current conditions were explained but some details or buildings are missing. | 10  The current conditions were explained fully and with details. |
| Were the map of the main street, and proposed photos with location map uploaded? | 0  No information was provided. | 5  Some information was provided but missing some uploads or quality photos. | 10  All information was provided with quality maps and photos. |
| Were the current city/town ordinances regarding oversight of design in the downtown provided along with a current building inventory? | 0  No information provided. | 5  Some information provided but missing details. | 10  All information was provided with details. |
| **Challenges** | | | |
| Were the potential project challenges outlined with a plan to address them? | 0  No information was provided. | 5  Some information was provided but missing details. | 10  Applicant has thoughtfully explored potential project challenges and provided potential solutions on how these will be addressed if the project is awarded. |