



**NCW
ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT
DISTRICT**

2023 North Central Washington Economic Development District Prioritization Process

The NCWEDD Regional Priority Projects Committee invites you to submit current projects to be ranked for the 2023 year. The committee ranks projects based on several established criteria, including measurable regional economic benefits, measurable community benefits, fully developed plan and strategy, alignment with NCWEDD goals and objectives, and on public/private partnerships.

Top-ranked projects will receive NCWEDD letters of support and fund-sourcing assistance.

Applications are **DUE by 4:00 PM December 9, 2022.**

Okanagan County applicants DO NOT need to apply; please direct questions to the Okanagan County Economic Alliance.

Questions? Please contact Alyce Brown at admin@ncwedd.com.

Only applications submitted on or before December 9, 2022, by 4:00 P.M. will be reviewed.

Applications are autosaved and can be completed over time.

Timeline

Tuesday, November 8, 2022

Notification of Prioritization Process is sent to NCWEDD regional partners and members.

Tuesday, November 15, 2022

Press Release and Social Media announcement to apply.

Friday, December 9, 2022

Deadline for all applications. They must be completed and in to NCWEDD no later than 4:00 p.m. Absolutely no late applications accepted.

Tuesday, January 17, 2023

Announcements to go out as a press release naming the selected ranked regional priority projects.

[Begin Application](#)

Evaluation Criterion and Weighting Factors

Key	Criteria	Explanation	Total Points
Project Readiness	Is the project ready to proceed?	Each proposal should be evaluated and rated based on its readiness to proceed (sign contract, advertise for bids, apply for matching money, etc...). For example, a project which has needed engineering documents, permits and environmental review completed would rate a 20, while a project that is in its early stages would rate a 1 to 5 depending on the details included in the project scope. Projects that represent discreet phases (e.g. a feasibility study or conceptual plan) required to move a project to construction of implementation would rate a 5 to 15, again depending on the project scope.	20
Local Commitment	Does the Proposal include evidence of local commitment in terms of support, funding, need, etc....	Each proposal should be evaluated and rated based on the level of local commitment described in the application. A project that shows strong local commitment in terms of dollars, in-kind support, history of positive action, evidence of efforts to secure funding from other appropriate sources, record of public participation, etc... would rate a 15 while a project with no firm evidence of local commitment would rate a 1.	15
Enhances Infrastructure and Economic Diversification	Does the proposal include physical infrastructure or other items required for economic diversification?	There is a wide variation to the type and scope of proposals. Each proposal should be evaluated and rated on its own merit based on a review of the information provided by the applicant.	25
Consistency with applicable local plans	Is the project consistent with the NCWEDD Strategic Plan and/or local Comprehensive Plans, Economic Plans, or Capital Facilities Plan?	Each proposal should be evaluated and rated on consistency with appropriate plans. A project that is detailed in existing, adopted plans should be rated a 20-25, a project that is in a draft plan a 10 to 20, and projects not in any plans 1 to 10.	25
Economic Impact	Will the project provide some measurable positive impact on Chelan, Douglas and/or Okanogan County's economy?	Each proposal should be evaluated and rated based on what type of economic impact the project will have. For example, a proposal that will generate new to retain existing jobs would rate a 20 to 25. Proposals that result in studies, reports or organizational capacity building, depending on the specific proposal would rate from 1-20. Proposals with little to no description in terms of economic impact would rate a 1 to 10.	25

Workforce Training	Will the project provide opportunities for workforce training upon completion	There is a wide variation to the type and scope of proposals. Each proposal should be evaluated and rated on its own merit based on a review of the information provided by the applicant.	10
Partnerships	Does the project create opportunities for the public/private partnerships, intergovernmental cooperation, or further existing commitments to private or public parties?	This criteria is intended to give weight to projects that involve other private or public entities. For example, a developer is extending a city water main to serve a new private development in an area that is presently underserved. The partnership in this instance could be that the city would participate in increasing the line size over that required for the proposed development to improved service to existing residents/customers and projected growth. Each proposal should be evaluated and rated on its own merit based on a review of the information provided by the applicant.	10
Leveraging	Does proposal leverage local, private, state, and federal dollars and/or technical resources?	Each proposal should be evaluated and rated based on the amount and type of assistance to be leveraged by the commitment of local resources. For example, a proposal that has secured most of the resources required but still has a funding gap would rate a 15 to 20, A proposal that leverages 75% or more of the of the assistance required for the success would also rate a 15 to 20. Projects that leverage from 50%-75% would rate 10 to 15, those that leverage 25%-50% would rate 5 to 10 and those that do not leverage any other resources would rate 1 to 5. The rating process should consider the amount requested when evaluating projects. For example, a small project (\$10,000 or less) should not necessarily be evaluated based on the amount of resources leveraged, but rather on the merits of the proposal. The leveraged dollars do not have to be in hand but at a minimum it must be clear what sources and amounts will be leveraged. <i>Additionally, efforts to leverage funding should be considered when evaluating projects as unsuccessful attempts may be justified; however, points should be withheld from projects who have clearly not made efforts to secure other funding.</i>	20

