

2008 PROJECT SCORING CRITERIA-FINAL

<u>CRITERIA</u>	<u>SCORE</u>
1. Project Tier	
<u>Tier 1 Projects</u>	5
Tier 1 projects are expected to produce the greatest economic benefits in terms of: (1) inducing private investment, creating or retaining jobs, increasing income levels and tax base; (2) Raising the quality of life for those in poverty or of low income means; (3) Resolving a problem where a direct threat to health and public safety exists.	
<u>Tier 2 Projects</u>	3
Tier 2 projects are expected to have less of an economic impact than Tier 1 projects. They are defined as those projects involving local businesses and industries generating less private investment, job creation-retention and income level benefit than Tier 1 projects but provide services or a function designed to further develop economic self sufficiency, entrepreneurialism, business and industry innovation, commercial development, housing projects, downtown investment, tourism and recreation projects.	
<u>Tier 3 Projects</u>	1
Tier 3 projects are defined as those projects that have the least impact on the economy by way of private investment and job creation-retention and income level benefit. These projects deserve merit and attention because of the potential economic development role they can play in the future and/or the important role they can play in providing needed public services. Types of projects included in this category are: (1) Projects or programs with economic development potential that are still in the conceptual or planning stage where the full scope has not as of yet been agreed to or completely defined; (2) Projects that are maintenance oriented but merit attention so the changes to existing infrastructure and facilities do not later have to be made due to a threat to health and public safety; (3) Local government public building or facility projects that are needed to carry out routine local government functions.	
 2. Unemployment Rate—based on county rates	
Unemployment Rate at least 225% of State Average	5
Unemployment Rate at least 180% of State Average	4
Unemployment Rate at least 150% of State Average	3
Unemployment Rate of at least 1% point above State Average	2
Unemployment Rate less than 1% point above State Average	1
Unemployment Rate less than US Average	0

2007 Annual Unemployment Rates for the East Central Wisconsin Region

County	Year	Unemp. Rate	Points
Calumet County	2007	4.8	0
Fond du Lac County	2007	4.8	0
Green Lake County	2007	5.5	1
Menominee County	2007	10.1	4
Marquette County	2007	5.9	2
Outagamie County	2007	4.7	0
Shawano County	2007	5.1	1
Waupaca County	2007	5.4	1
Waushara County	2007	5.4	1
Winnebago County	2007	4.6	0
Region (10-County)	2007	4.9	0
Wisconsin	2007	4.9	n/a

Source: Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development, Bureau of

3. Per Capita Income (PCI)—based on county rates

PCI not more than 50% of State Average	5
PCI not more than 60% of State Average	4
PCI not more than 70% of State Average	3
PCI not more than 80% above State Average	2
PCI greater than 80% and less than 100% of State Average	1
PCI greater than State Average	0

2006 Per Capita Income for the East Central Wisconsin Region

Area	2006 Per Capita Income	% of State Average	Points
Wisconsin	\$ 34,405	100.0%	0
Calumet	\$ 36,107	104.9%	0
Fond du Lac	\$ 32,923	95.7%	1
Green Lake	\$ 31,761	92.3%	1
Marquette	\$ 25,297	73.5%	2
Menominee	\$ 19,472	56.6%	4
Outagamie	\$ 34,446	100.1%	0
Shawano	\$ 27,497	79.9%	2
Waupaca	\$ 31,662	92.0%	1
Waushara	\$ 24,639	71.6%	2
Region (10-County)	\$ 32,709	95.1%	1
Winnebago	\$ 33,874	98.5%	1

Source: Regional Economic Information System, Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce, 2006

4. Number of Jobs Created

100 or more	5
75 to 99	4
50 to 74	3
25 to 49	2
1 to 24	1
No Jobs	0

5. Project Readiness (based on timeframe and funding secured)

Immediately	5
1-2 Years	3
Over 2 Years	1
No time frame	0

6. Regional Significance

Significant Impact	5
Moderate Impact	3
Little Impact	1
No Impact	0

7. Local Significance

Significant Impact	5
Moderate Impact	3
Little Impact	1
No Impact	0

8. EDA Investment Policy Guidelines

a. Be market-based and results-driven.

Meets or exceeds the guideline	5
Almost meets the guideline	3
Somewhat meets the guideline	1
Does not meet the guideline/no response	0

b. Have strong organizational leadership.

Meets or exceeds the guideline	5
Almost meets the guideline	3
Somewhat meets the guideline	1
Does not meet the guideline/no response	0

c. Advance productivity, innovation, and entrepreneurship

Meets or exceeds the guideline	5
Almost meets the guideline	3
Somewhat meets the guideline	1
Does not meet the guideline/no response	0

d. Look beyond the immediate economic horizon, anticipate economic changes, and diversify the local and regional economy.

Meets or exceeds the guideline	5
Almost meets the guideline	3
Somewhat meets the guideline	1
Does not meet the guideline/no response	0

e. Demonstrate a high degree of commitment by exhibiting: (1) High levels of local-government or nonprofit matching funds and private-sector leverage; (2) Clear and unified leadership and support by local elected officials (3) Strong cooperation between the business sector, relevant regional partners, and local, state, and federal governments.

Meets or exceeds the guideline	5
Almost meets the guideline	3
Somewhat meets the guideline	1
Does not meet the guideline/no response	0

MAXIMUM TOTAL POINTS: 60