

FY 2013-14
Evaluation Form
PALM BEACH COUNTY THOROUGHFARE BEAUTIFICATION GRANT
RFP for State Thoroughfares

KPBCB Project Number: # _____
 Project Name / Location: _____
 Applicant Name: _____
 Grant Requested: \$ _____
 Proposed Match: \$ _____
 Total Project Cost: \$ _____
 Evaluator's Name: _____
 Evaluator's Signature _____

Total Point Score:

KPBCB Recommendation: \$ _____
 KPBCB Recommendation: \$ _____

Date: _____

A. Basic Eligibility Requirements Met (Yes or No)

- _____ Project located on state owned and maintained thoroughfare with documented authorization for project by appropriate state representative (FDOT Grant Coordinator).
- _____ Authorization letters obtained from other public/private entities affected by the project.
- _____ On-going maintenance entity committed.
- _____ Conceptual Plans prepared by a Florida registered landscape architect pre-qualified by FDOT
- _____ Minimum 50% match provided by applicant/other grants (unless REDI qualified).
- _____ Application form, attachments, drawings and documentation complete and legible.
- _____ Maximum of 10% for design and post design fees.
- _____ Vegetation materials and installation costs combined equal or exceed 50% of all project costs.
- _____ Applicant has successfully implemented and maintained project(s) which previously received funding by this grant program.
- _____ Applicant has submitted closeout documents for each previously awarded outstanding grant per eligibility requirements.

	Project: Eligible or Not (Yes/No)
	Application: Eligible or Not (Yes/No)

B. Previous Grant Status (5 Points Maximum, check only one item below)

- _____ (5 Pts.) Applicant has never received a grant through this program.
- _____ (4 Pts.) Project is clearly a later phase of a project which has previously received funding through this grant program.
- _____ (2 Pts.) Applicant has previously successfully implemented and maintained project(s) through this grant program.
- _____ (-5 Pts.) Application has not been previously funded by KPBCB, but applicant is proposing to replace healthy, non-invasive and safe (sight lines) plant material.
- _____ (Ineligible) Project is a previous KPBCB grant award proposing replacement because of unsuccessful implementation & maintenance.

	Total Points
--	--------------

C. Clarity of Application (15 Points)

- _____ (0-5) Is the application accurate and easily understood?
- _____ (0-5) Does the "Summary of Project Costs" form correlate well with the "Supplemental Detailed Budget"?
- _____ (0-5) Are the detailed unit costs reasonable by industry standards?
- _____ (- 5) Application components do not correlate and cannot be understood.

Total Points

D. Community Values (10 Points)

- _____ (0-2) Does the project have high potential for a positive public relations impact?
- _____ (0-2) Does the project have high potential to generate a sense of community pride and ownership?
- _____ (0-4) Is the project anticipated to be a catalyst to inspire further reinvestment in the community?

Total Points

E. Community Support (15 Points)

- _____ (0-3) Does the project involve documented partnerships with private businesses or volunteer groups to provide in-kind services or cash?
- _____ (0-3) Is adequate public support documented?
- _____ (0-9) Is the project ready to move forward with committed resources?

Total Points

F. Environmental Value (15 Points)

- _____ (0-5) Does the project screen undesirable views and buffer traffic noise?
- _____ (0-5) Does the project significantly increase canopy cover within the right-of-way?
- _____ (0-5) Does the project replace existing inappropriate species such as invasive exotics, or replace existing plantings that don't meet roadway safety standards.
- _____ (- 5) Does the project remove healthy plants (excluding those not meeting roadway safety standards or inappropriate species).

Total Points

G. Cost Sharing (10 Points)

- _____ (0) Is applicant's match greater than 50%, but less than 51%?
- _____ (3) Is applicant's match 51% or greater, but less than 55%?
- _____ (5) Is applicant's match 55% or greater, but less than 60%?
- _____ (7) Is applicant's match 60% or greater, but less than 65%?
- _____ (10) Is applicant's match 65% or greater?
- _____ (10) Rural Economic Development Initiative (REDI) qualified.

Total Points

H. Visibility (10 Points)

- _____ (0-8) Will the project be readily visible to large numbers of people?
- _____ (0-2) Does the project beautify a municipal gateway, public building, or other landmark or significant area (such as a native ecosystem), while also beautifying a larger thoroughfare context?

Total Points

I. Design Quality (20 Points)

- _____ (0-3) Are native, drought tolerant, high wind resistant and low-maintenance plant materials utilized?
- _____ (0-3) Are plant species tolerant of harsh street environmental conditions (heat, wind, dust, alkaline soils, etc.)?
- _____ (0-3) Are plant species designed in compatible groupings related to needs (water, sun, soil PH, etc.)?
- _____ (0-3) Are native / compost soils, mulch, and slow release or organic fertilizers utilized as conservation measures?
- _____ (0-3) Does the design encourage long-term survivability of plant species for long-term investment?
- _____ (0-5) Does the design respect traffic safety (are visibility clear sight lines and clear zone setbacks shown)?

Total Points

100 POINTS MAXIMUM TOTAL

Evaluator's Comments:
