

**Ohio Job Ready Sites Program
Application Scoring Sheet – Guidance for the Evaluators**

This guidance assists in helping determine the *subjective* elements of the application scoring sheet, as cross-referenced by itemized topic headings. Provided below are suggested measures of *quality* of a submitted application *in relation to any other applications reviewed* by the evaluator, *any site development experience* held by the evaluator, and the *overall content strength* of the individual application.

This document is meant only as guidance; the scoring of an application is on a case-by-case basis and in the best judgment of the evaluator.

<u>General Guidance – Evaluating the Application as a Whole</u>	
Acceptable:	Application is <u>adequate</u> . The proposed project meets the <u>minimums</u> set forth for participation under the program. The feasibility of the project can be described as <u>meeting all program requirements and objectives within the allowed time period, but to do so could be challenging</u> .
Preferable:	Application is <u>more desirable</u> in the breadth and scope of the proposed project than that merely required under the program. The project's feasibility can be stated as <u>more easily meeting all program requirements within the allowed time period</u> . Any challenges standing in the way of completing the proposed project have been identified, along with adequate explanations as to how those challenges will be resolved.
Extraordinary:	Application <u>goes far beyond the ordinary</u> degree or measure of other proposed projects and/or has exceptionally strong content describing the project and planned improvements. The proposed project is <u>exceptional or remarkable</u> in its desirability. Project feasibility is <u>unquestionable</u> , requiring program investments in a comparatively fewer number of improvement areas for the site to be certified.

This guidance assists in helping determine the *subjective* elements of the application scoring sheet, as cross-referenced by itemized topic headings. Provided below are suggested measures of *quality* of a submitted application *in relation to any other applications reviewed* by the evaluator, *any site development experience* held by the evaluator, and the *overall content strength* of the individual application.

(B) Site Marketing Plan	
Acceptable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application contains a discussion of the applicant's general economic development activities. • Applicant's proposed marketing activities lack specific reference to the site or local and regional industry cluster.
Preferable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant provides a general discussion of staff and budget resources. • The applicant demonstrates some involvement in local, regional, or state-level economic development activities. • Specific references to the site under any proposed marketing activities are of average scope and breadth. • The applicant discusses local and regional industry clusters.
Extraordinary:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff resources and budget appropriations are clearly identified and appropriate to the task. • Applicant has a strong history of involvement in local, regional, and state-level economic development and other activities, including, but not limited to, outreach to site selection consultants and attendance at relevant national trade shows, programs, or conferences. • The application explains clearly the steps to be taken to market the site specifically after certification. • The applicant has a demonstrated history conducting marketing or advertising campaigns for fundraising and/or to solicit economic development prospects. • The applicant has a strong Internet presence and the necessary skills and staff capacity to strongly market the site via the web. • The applicant has demonstrated a strong understanding of local and regional industry clusters.

This guidance assists in helping determine the *subjective* elements of the application scoring sheet, as cross-referenced by itemized topic headings. Provided below are suggested measures of *quality* of a submitted application *in relation to any other applications reviewed* by the evaluator, *any site development experience* held by the evaluator, and the *overall content strength* of the individual application.

(C) Positive Economic Impact	
Acceptable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any described positive economic impact is general and unsubstantiated by data or market analyses.
Preferable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive economic impact is discussed and supported by some critical analysis and data.
Extraordinary:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any industry sectors to be targeted for post-certification development efforts have been identified clearly, as well as a detailed description of any multiplier or ripple effects and any positive tax revenue effects to result.
(D) Need to Make Improvements	
Acceptable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant sets forth the general need to improve the site, but activity prior to application indicates average community commitment to improving the site in advance of this program.
Preferable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improvements to the site are needed, and the applicant does an appropriate job articulating those needs, as well as the benefits to result from improving the site.
Extraordinary:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site clearly is critical to the area's economic viability.
(E) Need for Financial Assistance	
Acceptable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surrounding community is not in economic distress or otherwise marked by high unemployment or recent job losses. There exist some financial resources available to improve the site, but those resources alone may not be sufficient to complete all improvements needed to reach certification levels.
Preferable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surrounding community in which the project is located is marked by high labor surplus levels, indicia of economic distress and/or is listed by the ODOD as being a Priority Investment Area (see http://www.odod.state.oh.us/cms/uploadedfiles/Research/G200000015.pdf). There exist some financial resources available to improve the site, but those resources alone may not be sufficient to complete all improvements needed to reach certification levels.
Extraordinary:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The surrounding community in which the project is located is marked by high labor surplus levels, indicia of economic distress and/or is listed by the ODOD as being a Priority Investment Area (see http://www.odod.state.oh.us/cms/uploadedfiles/Research/G200000015.pdf). Any further improvements to the site could not be made <i>but for</i> the availability of financial assistance under the program.

This guidance assists in helping determine the *subjective* elements of the application scoring sheet, as cross-referenced by itemized topic headings. Provided below are suggested measures of *quality* of a submitted application *in relation to any other applications reviewed* by the evaluator, *any site development experience* held by the evaluator, and the *overall content strength* of the individual application.

(F) Time Period to Add Site to Inventory	
Acceptably short:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application materials suggest little or no planning or implementation prior to the creation of the program or the time by which application is due. • Many improvements must be made to the site before certification can be obtained under the program. • Improvement of the site to certification-levels likely will require the entire 36 month period allowed. • Legal elements of the site are not well identified, and site control is incomplete.
Preferably short:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans taken and actions performed by the applicant and others to improve the site already have begun. • A number of improvements still must be made to the site before certification can be obtained under the program. • Improvement of the site to certification-levels likely will require 24 to 36 months. • Some or most legal elements of the site are clearly identified, but site control remains less than complete at time of application.
Extraordinarily short:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed project was identified formally, well in advance of application, for specific infrastructure improvements to attract large-scale development. • The applicant or others have made significant investments to improve the site, resulting in the need for a comparatively fewer number of improvements to be made for the site to reach certification levels. • Improvement of the site to certification-levels likely will require less than 12 months. • All material legal documentation, including determinations of fair market value, have been collected and are readily available, and site control is complete or in place.

This guidance assists in helping determine the *subjective* elements of the application scoring sheet, as cross-referenced by itemized topic headings. Provided below are suggested measures of *quality* of a submitted application *in relation to any other applications reviewed* by the evaluator, *any site development experience* held by the evaluator, and the *overall content strength* of the individual application.

(G) Site's Attractiveness, As of Time of Application	
Acceptably attractive:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site profile information is provided, but questions arise and/or inconsistencies exist in described site condition. • The proposed project involves a site that is marked by one or more material obstacles to development, yet the application does not discuss adequately how to resolve such obstacles. • The site is located a significant distance away from utilities and transportation. • Site is located within a 90-minute drive of sufficient labor pools and educational institutions. • The site is bordered by one or more developments and/or activities incompatible with the proposed end use to occur at the site after being certified.
Preferably attractive:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site profile information is complete. • Although the project site could be viewed as being marked by material obstacle(s) to development, the application discusses the means by which such obstacles will be resolved, and the means are described completely and satisfactorily. • The site is located a reasonable distance from utilities and transportation. • Site is located within a 60-minute drive of sufficient labor pools and educational institutions. • The site is not bordered by, or in close proximity to, developments and activities incompatible with the proposed end use to occur on the site after certification.
Extraordinarily attractive:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All site profile items are indicated clearly and completely. • Material obstacles required for final development have been identified and many have been resolved prior to application. • The site is located in close proximity to utilities and transportation and the area boasts a generous supply of appropriate housing stock. • Site is located within a 30-minute drive of a large pool of appropriately skilled workers, vocational schools and/or research universities. • The site is not located near developments and activities incompatible with the proposed end use to occur on the site after certification. • The site is well-known to local, regional, and state economic development professionals, and has been viewed on previous occasions for large-scale investment by viable business prospects, with such prospects declining to locate operations there for non-site specific reasons (e.g., site not chosen because business prospect decided ultimately to not go forward with the planned investment).

This guidance assists in helping determine the *subjective* elements of the application scoring sheet, as cross-referenced by itemized topic headings. Provided below are suggested measures of *quality* of a submitted application *in relation to any other applications reviewed* by the evaluator, *any site development experience* held by the evaluator, and the *overall content strength* of the individual application.

(H) Site Improvement Plan	
Acceptable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application addresses each of the relevant improvement categories listed, but does so incompletely or scantily; additional information is needed than present in the application materials to understand the full scope and breadth of the proposed improvements. • The number and type of improvements needed at the site are numerous and/or material.
Preferable:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application discusses the relevant improvement categories listed, does so completely, yet some questions and/or inconsistencies exist in the improvement plan as described. • The number and type of improvements are not material in number and type given the resources available under the program.
Extraordinary:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application discusses completely the relevant improvement categories, and such improvements are fully described and articulated, showing the applicant's acute knowledge and familiarity with the site's infrastructure needs. • The number and type of improvements needed for the site to reach certification levels are reasonable. • The improvements to be made are in direct compliance with preliminary feasibility reviews, including but not limited to traffic impact and environmental studies, having been performed in advance of application. • Many of the necessary utility and transportation access thresholds are close to being met already, having been improved previously by the applicant or others.

This guidance assists in helping determine the *subjective* elements of the application scoring sheet, as cross-referenced by itemized topic headings. Provided below are suggested measures of *quality* of a submitted application *in relation to any other applications reviewed* by the evaluator, *any site development experience* held by the evaluator, and the *overall content strength* of the individual application.

(I) Project's Compatibility with Area Priorities	
Fits acceptably:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to application, the surrounding community has in place a completed or up-to-date economic development plan. • The site is included in, or referenced by, the community's economic development plan.
Fits preferably:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to application, the surrounding community has a completed and up-to-date comprehensive or master plan, as well as an economic development plan, yet the comprehensive or master plan may not reference specifically the site. • The proposed project ties-in with the comprehensive or master plan.
Fits extraordinarily:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The surrounding community has a well-established, well-supported, and up-to-date comprehensive or master plan controlling development within the area. • The proposed project is a critical component of this master plan, having been identified in the early stages of planning as being a linchpin for development and the overall success of the master plan. • The proposed improvements to occur are in compliance with the improvements and/or end uses identified for the site within the master plan. • The project site is surrounded by comparable developments and uses following the master plan's guidelines.