

# HEAL Scoring Rubric

The following are the review criteria the review team will use to score each application for the Historic Economic Asset Lifeline (HEAL) grant. Each grant will be rated based on the criteria listed and given a score out of one hundred.

	Exemplary	Exceeds Expectations	Meets Expectations	Needs Improvement	Insufficient Evidence
<b>(1) Revitalizing Downtown Building and District – 30 Points Possible</b>	The building is vacant and in poor condition. The proposal presents a clear, compelling plan to drive ongoing community engagement, growth, and investment. This project demonstrates strong potential to serve as a catalyst for transformative revitalization.  25-30 Points	The building is vacant and in fair condition. The project shows clear potential to enhance the downtown area, though long-term impact and sustainability are less well-defined.  19-24 Points	The building is partially occupied and in fair condition. The project proposes meaningful improvements and includes some evidence of community support and broader revitalization potential.  13-18 Points	The building is occupied and in fair condition. The project may result in modest improvements, with limited impact on the surrounding community and local economy.  9-12 Points	The building is occupied, and the proposed project offers minimal transformation or community benefit.  0-8 Points
<b>(2) Strength of Business Concept and Leveraged Funds – 25 Points Possible</b>	Business confirmed and ready to occupy space post building rehab. Owner exceeds 1:1 match, showing strong commitment. Clear funding gap; HEAL is essential to closing it and moving the project forward.  22-25 Points	Business concept is credible and likely to launch post building rehab. Owner meets or slightly exceeds 1:1 match. HEAL funds contribute meaningfully, though the funding gap could be better defined.  16-21 Points	Business concept exists but lacks clear timeline or commitment. Owner meets basic match. Some investment shown, but limited clarity on HEAL’s catalytic role.  11-15 Points	Business plan is vague or uncertain. Match is minimal. Weak demonstration of owner commitment and unclear need for HEAL funding.  6-10 Points	No business identified or plan included. No owner investment is shown. No explanation of HEAL’s role or necessity.  0-5 Points

# HEAL Scoring Rubric

<p><b>(3) Feasibility – 20 Points Possible</b></p>	<p>Clear contractor-supported plan confirms the building can be saved with accelerated timeline. Budget and scope are well defined. Structural and environmental concerns are addressed with complete studies or actionable plans.</p> <p>18-20 Points</p>	<p>Strong documentation shows contractor involvement and demonstrates feasibility. Minor gaps exist in environmental or structural planning, but overall project appears realistic and achievable. Project plan clearly fits into timeline or shows accelerated timeline.</p> <p>15-17 Points</p>	<p>Basic evidence of feasibility provided. Some elements (e.g., structural or contamination) are acknowledged with partial plans, but full clarity is lacking. Some information about contractor involvement is provided.</p> <p>11-14 Points</p>	<p>Limited documentation or unclear timeline. Feasibility is uncertain due to missing or incomplete environmental or structural plans. Contractor involvement is limited or unclear.</p> <p>6-10 Points</p>	<p>No clear proof the building can be saved. Structural or contamination issues not addressed or planned for. Contractors are not secured, and timeline goals are not likely due to unclear scope or lack of planning.</p> <p>0-5 Points</p>
<p><b>(4) Timeline – 10 Points Possible</b></p>	<p>Detailed realistic and ambitious timeline. Construction starts within 4 months, finishes in 12–18 months, and tenant is operational within 20 months of award.</p> <p>8-10 Points</p>	<p>Timeline shows strong planning and efficiency. Construction starts within 4 months, and tenant is in place within 24 months of award.</p> <p>6-7 Points</p>	<p>Timeline meets baseline requirements. Construction begins within 4 months, and tenant is operational within 30 months of award.</p> <p>4-5 Points</p>	<p>Timeline shows delays or gaps. Construction begins after 4 months, or tenant occupancy exceeds 30 months of award.</p> <p>2-3 Points</p>	<p>Timeline is unclear or unrealistic. Key milestones are absent or suggest the project is not feasible.</p> <p>0-1 Points</p>
<p><b>(5) Historical Significance &amp; Preservation - 10 Points Possible</b></p>	<p>Fully preserves key features per guidelines. Strong documentation. Building is highly significant in design, history, or community value.</p> <p>8-10 Points</p>	<p>Good preservation with strong alignment to design guidelines. Most documentation in place. Building has some historic or architectural value.</p> <p>6-7 Points</p>	<p>Basic effort with partial alignment to design guidelines and limited documentation. Older building with modest significance.</p> <p>4-5 Points</p>	<p>Minimal preservation or documentation. Weak alignment to design guidelines. Limited historical or architectural value.</p> <p>2-3 Points</p>	<p>No clear preservation effort, documentation, or significance. Not 50+ years old or architecturally notable.</p> <p>0-1 Points</p>

# HEAL Scoring Rubric

<b>(6) Budget – 5 Points Possible</b>	Budget is clear, detailed, and fully aligns with the project scope. All line items are supported by bids or estimates.  5 Points	Budget aligns well with the project scope. Most line items are supported by solid documentation.  4 Points	Budget is generally consistent with the scope, though some line items or estimates lack detail or clarity.  3 Points	Budget includes questionable or unclear items. Limited or incomplete support from bids or estimates.  2 Points	Budget lacks alignment with project scope. Little to no supporting documentation provided.  0-1 Points
<b>Total: 100 Points</b>					