



MEASURE U APPLICATION COMMITTEE

SPECIAL MEETING

TUESDAY, MARCH 12, 2013

TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS/SUITE Z, MINARET VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER

8:30 AM – 3:30 PM

NOTE: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Town Clerk at (760) 934-8989, ext. 267. Notification 48 hours prior to the meeting will enable the Town to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility to this meeting. (28 CFR 13.102-35.104 ADA Title II)

ROLL CALL: Committee Members: Bill Sauser, Joyce Turner, and Sandy Hogan.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. Regular meeting of February 12, 2013

DISCUSSION ITEMS

2. Discuss and provide recommendations to Town Council on the use of Town funds for special events.
3. Conduct the 2013 Measure U Spring applicant presentations and funding recommendations for Town Council consideration on April 3, 2013.
 - a. 8:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. – Applicant Presentations
 - b. 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. – Funding Recommendations
4. Schedule next meeting of the Measure U Application Committee
 - a. Request for discussion items

ADJOURNMENT



MEASURE U APPLICATION COMMITTEE

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2013

TOWN COUNCIL CHAMBERS/SUITE Z, MINARET VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTER

8:30 AM – 10:30 AM

The meeting was called to order by staff at 8:40 a.m.

In attendance: Bill Sauser and Sandy Hogan. Apologies received from Joyce Turner

Staff in attendance: Stuart Brown, Haslip Hayes.

PUBLIC COMMENTS:

None.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

1. A motion was made by Mr. Sauser, seconded by Ms. Hogan to accept the December 12, 2012 meeting minutes as presented. All in favor (2-0). Motion approved.

DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. **Review the 2013 Measure U Spring funding applications, conduct the Measure Primary Filter evaluations, confirm the order of applicant presentations, and provide any necessary direction to staff.**

Staff informed the Committee that one application was received after the February 1, 2013 application deadline. The application presented was from Mammoth Trails in the amount of \$7,000 for special event barricades. The Committee by consensus determined that as this application was partially funded by Measure R in the fall, the Committee directed staff to include it in the 2013 Measure U spring award funding process.

The Committee reviewed the 2013 Measure U spring applications and by consensus, determined that all applications satisfy the Measure U Primary Filter requirements. All funding applications will move-on to the applicant presentations scheduled on Tuesday, February 26, 2013 at 8:30 a.m.

The applicant presentations are scheduled on Tuesday, February 26, 2013 beginning at 8:30 a.m. in Suite Z. The Committee by consensus determined the following order of applicant presentations:

1. Town of Mammoth Lakes - Municipal Wayfinding
2. ESTA - NextBus GPS Enhancement
3. Mammoth Track Club - Construction & Programming
4. MMCF/TOML - Mammoth Kamikaze Bike Games
5. SWFFF - Fly Fishing Faire
6. Black Diamond Foods - Mammoth Margarita Festival
7. MLEC – Joint application for Summer Arts & Culture Event support
8. Mammoth Lakes Jazz Jubilee
9. Chamber Music Unbound
10. Mammoth Bluegrass Festival
11. Villagefest
12. Children's Fishing Festival
13. Fiesta Caliente
14. Mammoth Food & Wine
15. Old Mammoth Road Events
16. Mammoth2Bishop Bike Ride
17. Sierra Summer Festival
18. Mammoth Rocks
19. Hop n' Sage
20. Winterburn
21. Mammoth Trails

It was stated by the Committee that each applicant will be limited to a 5 minute presentation, and can use the supplied computer/projector for a PowerPoint presentation. The Committee has scheduled 10 minutes per applicant for follow-up questions. All applicants are required to attend. Applicants are not required to use the 5 minute allotment, but the presentation will be timed.

After a review of the applications, the Committee directed staff to request the following information from the funding applicants prior to February 26, 2013:

- A. 2012 Profit/Loss statement that identifies actual revenue, expenditures and any net profit.
- B. Applicant Question: If your funding request is greater than, or less than your 2012 Measure U request, please explain.
- C. If you requested multiple years of funding, please project the number of years and amount you will be requesting. Be prepared to justify your response.
- D. A presentation from the Mammoth Lakes Foundation regarding the proposed special event venue.
- E. An inventory of special event equipment and any replacement expenditures required by the ML Jazz Jubilee.
- F. The inclusion of the Mammoth Margarita Festival in the MLEC Joint application.

In general, the Committee is also requesting additional ideas and comments from the applicants on how to most efficiently use Measure U funds.

2. Discuss and provide recommendations to Town Council on the use of Town funds for special events.

Staff made a presentation to the Committee, and there was discussion among Committee members and the public.

Staff stated that the Recreation Commission nominated Commissioner Stehlik and Commissioner Turner to conduct further research on this issue and they will present their findings at the March 5, 2013 regular meeting.

Prior to presenting this item to the Town Council, the Committee directed staff to distribute the 5 questions listed in the Staff Report (below) to funding applicants to gather their thoughts and recommendations.

- A. If an event realizes a surplus, should the surplus funds or a portion of the surplus funds be returned to Measure R/U? And if so, what percentage of the funds should be returned?
- B. Should there be two separate policies for non-profit and for-profit organizations? And if so, what would the policies be? For example, in the case of for-profits, should a percentage of funds, equal to the percentage received from Measure U be returned to the fund? And secondly, for non-profit organizations should the designated funds be restricted for a specific purpose?
- C. Should the Performance Report provide greater transparency of event finances that specifically identifies how surplus funds where/will be used by the funding recipient?
- D. Should Town Council have oversight on how the surplus event funds be used for organizations?
- E. Should a separate funding source such as incremental TOT revenue derived from special events be used to fund event organizers?

Staff will present the findings to the Measure U Application Committee on February 26, 2013.

ADJOURNMENT

The Committee adjourned the meeting to February 26, 2013 in Suite Z at 8:30 a.m. to receive funding presentations from the 2013 Measure U spring award funding applicants.

**MEASURE U APPLICATION COMMITTEE
STAFF REPORT**

Subject: Discuss and provide recommendations to Town Council on the use of Town funds for special events.

Initiated by: Mammoth Lakes Town Council

Written by: Stuart Brown, Recreation Manager

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this item is for the Measure U Application Committee to discuss and provide recommendations to Town Council on the use of Town funds for special events, specifically as it relates to Measure R, and Measure U special use funds.

BACKGROUND

Town Council is scheduled to discuss the potential implementation of a policy for the appropriate use of Town funds (Measure R/Measure U) for special events.

The Town Attorney has drafted two papers relating to Town funds, or specifically Measure R and Measure U. The first Memo titled "Measures R and U: Ability to "Supplant" was published on September 16, 2011, and the second was published on September 12, 2012, titled: "Administration of Town Funds." Neither of these documents specifically addresses the appropriate use of Town funds for special events.

ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION

On February 12, 2013 at the regular meeting of the Measure U application Committee, staff made a presentation to the Committee and there was discussion among Committee members and the public.

Prior to presenting this item to the Town Council, the Committee directed staff to distribute the 5 questions listed in the Staff Report (below) to funding applicants to gather their thoughts and recommendations.

- A. If an event realizes a surplus, should the surplus funds or a portion of the surplus funds be returned to Measure R/U? And if so, what percentage of the funds should be returned?
- B. Should there be two separate policies for non-profit and for-profit organizations? And if so, what would the policies be? For example, in the case of for-profits, should a percentage of funds, equal to the percentage received from Measure U be returned to the fund? And secondly, for non-profit organizations should the designated funds be restricted for a specific purpose?
- C. Should the Performance Report provide greater transparency of event finances that specifically identifies how surplus funds where/will be used by the funding recipient?
- D. Should Town Council have oversight on how the surplus event funds be used for organizations?
- E. Should a separate funding source such as incremental TOT revenue derived from special events be used to fund event organizers?

Staff have collated the responses received to date, and is seeking direction from the Committee on this subject. Staff also received communication from members of the MLEC requesting additional time to collate their responses.

The Recreation Commission will discuss this item on March 5, 2013 at their regular meeting. The recommendation of staff is to convene a joint workshop that includes members of the Mammoth Lakes Events Coalition (MLEC). Staff will present dates for Committee consideration.

RECOMMENDATION

Discuss and provide recommendations to Town Council on the use of Town funds for special events.

Attachment: Responses to "Use of Town Funds" by Measure U funding applicants.

Feb. 13, 2013

Dear 2013 Measure U spring funding applicants,

On Tuesday, February 12, 2013 the Measure U Application Committee discussed the use of Town funds (Measure R/U) for special events. Action from the meeting was to distribute the 5 questions listed below to funding applicants to gather their thoughts and recommendations.

1. If an event realizes a surplus, should the surplus funds or a portion of the surplus funds be returned to Measure R/U? And if so, what percentage (MLEC guidelines?) of the funds should be returned?
2. Should there be two separate policies for non-profit and for-profit organizations? And if so, what would the policies be? For example, in the case of for-profits, should a percentage of funds, equal to the percentage received from Measure U be returned to the fund? And secondly, for non-profit organizations should the designated funds be restricted for a specific purpose?
3. Should the Performance Report provide greater transparency of event finances that specifically identifies how surplus funds where/will be used by the funding recipient?
4. Should Town Council have oversight on how the surplus event funds be used for organizations?
5. Should a separate funding source such as incremental TOT revenue derived from special events be used to fund event organizers?

In general, the Committee is also requesting additional ideas and comments from the applicants on how to most efficiently use Measure U funds.

Thank you in advance for providing your thoughts and recommendations regarding this important policy item. Please reply with your comments no later than Monday, February 25, 2013. Staff will present the findings to the Measure U Application Committee on February 26, 2013.

Kind regards,

Stu

MARK DEEDS – MLEC COORDINATOR

Stuart/Sandy/Bill/Joyce,

These are all very important items to be discussed and remain key action items on the list for the MLEC. As you know, the MLEC has already begun discussing these items but admittedly has a long way to go in this process. I am not sure if requiring the applicants to individually develop answers to these question prior to the February 26 presentation will be the most productive or realistic expectation. I think at best a consensus may be reached on these questions but substantive answers, given the limited amount of time, will be lacking.

Properly researching and addressing these items represents a lot of work and the primary reason why the MLEC is continuing to seriously look at an executive director or administrator to keep this momentum moving forward. This, to my my knowledge, would be precedent setting and critically important for Mammoth. I am currently unaware of any other cities that have a similar type of Measure (U), U committee and a special events coalition. Not to mention MLT, a passionate Recreation Commission and Council all committed to the same mission and purpose. We have a very special and unique opportunity and a committed group of individuals in the MLEC to keep this moving forward. Therefore, I suggest not rushing this. It needs to be done right and we will need more time to accomplish this.

I am taking a big step back from directly involving myself in the production and creation of specific events but remain very interested in advancing with the Coalition and its mission. Addressing these questions is a key component of this and too important to rush .

One of the major benefits of the MLEC is it is comprised of like minded, professional event producers that combined can arrive at more thoroughly vetted answers to the above questions. Please consider allowing the coalition an extension to gather the necessary data and information in order to provide you with a much more complete and thorough reply to these questions. The MLEC could commit to a date prior to the next funding cycle.

I understand Sean and Teri on the Recreation Commission have volunteered to begin researching some of the items below. Please forward this to them as I would like to assist them in any way possible.

Thank you very much for all of the time that you are contributing to this process.

Mark Deeds

C. 760-709-6459

ESTA

The answers to the Follow-up Questions for ESTA's Spring 2013 Measure U application are listed below. For the most part, I don't believe the questions really apply to ESTA's non-event project application. Nonetheless, answers are supplied.

1. ESTA's 2013 grant application is for a new project. Accordingly, no previous financial statement exists for a prior GPS enhancement project.
2. ESTA applied for, and was awarded \$24,000 through the 2012 Measure U program for Special Event Transportation. A fund balance of \$13,000 remains in the special event trolley fund for use this summer. That project was completely separate from ESTA's 2013 application for GPS enhancement for the trolleys totaling \$19,000. Accordingly, a comparison of the two dollar amounts is not meaningful.
3. ESTA is not requesting multiple years of funding.

Please contact me if you need any further information.

John Helm
Executive Director
Eastern Sierra Transit Authority
760.872.1901 x12

DAN LEHMAN – BLUEGRASS FESTIVAL

- A. If an event realizes a surplus, should the surplus funds or a portion of the surplus funds be returned to Measure R/U? And if so, what percentage (MLEC guidelines?) of the funds should be returned?

Surplus funds from ‘for-profits’ should be returned in their entirety.

- B. Should there be two separate policies for non-profit and for-profit organizations? And if so, what would the policies be? For example, in the case of for-profits, should a percentage of funds, equal to the percentage received from Measure U be returned to the fund? And secondly, for non-profit organizations should the designated funds be restricted for a specific purpose?

Surplus funds from ‘non-profits’ should be exempt. Surplus funds from ‘for-profit’ organizations should be returned in their entirety. I suggest that the returned ‘for-profit’ funds be set-aside for the establishment of a special “tourist aid” fund. A “tourist aid” fund could be utilized to assist stranded visitors who, though special circumstances, have become stranded without funds to return home. Special circumstances would be injury, victims of crime, auto malfunction, identity theft or any circumstance deemed worthy of assistance. Worthy assistance would include basic necessities, such as: lodging, auto repair, emergency evacuation, food, transportation to their home, etc. Further, the fund should be administered solely by Mammoth Lakes Tourism (to eliminate unnecessary bureaucracy). The establishment of such a fund as this would put the Town of Mammoth Lakes in a favorable light, as viewed by other similar recreational towns and the public at-large.

- C. Should the Performance Report provide greater transparency of event finances that specifically identifies how surplus funds where/will be used by the funding recipient?

Yes

- D. Should Town Council have oversight on how the surplus event funds be used for organizations?

Yes

- E. Should a separate funding source such as incremental TOT revenue derived from special events be used to fund event organizers?

Yes – ‘Non-Profits’ only

In general, the Committee is also requesting additional ideas and comments from the applicants on how to most efficiently use Measure U funds.

Measure U Funds should be distributed on a more incentivized, pre-determined sliding scale. For example, new events (1-3 years) should receive the majority of funds available. 'For-profit' events that have been in existence from 3 to 5+ years, should have proven themselves and should not be eligible for future funds.

ALANA LEVIN – MAMMOTH TRAILS

- A. If an event realizes a surplus, should the surplus funds or a portion of the surplus funds be returned to Measure R/U? And if so, what percentage (MLEC guidelines?) of the funds should be returned? what surplus? are you referring to profits on the event? No would be my answer. If you want an event to pay for what was received through Measure U, then the event should just incorporate a known amount in the event's expenses.
- B. Should there be two separate policies for non-profit and for-profit organizations? And if so, what would the policies be? For example, in the case of for-profits, should a percentage of funds, equal to the percentage received from Measure U be returned to the fund? And secondly, for non-profit organizations should the designated funds be restricted for a specific purpose? we are a non-profit, but i don't have an opinion either way. Not sure why a non-profit would have more restrictions. Certainly, there would be guidelines on how designated funds would be used in both cases as is the current structure, correct?
- C. Should the Performance Report provide greater transparency of event finances that specifically identifies how surplus funds where/will be used by the funding recipient? in our application for barricades, many events are using the barricades and like Measure R the town would own and manage. If our event/organization received barricades from Measure U funds, and we owned the barricades, then I understand paying back a portion or all of the equipment and then we own it and use it for our event - if others want to use it, they borrow or rent from our organization.
- D. Should Town Council have oversight on how the surplus event funds be used for organizations? I would rather not receive funding if the Town is going to oversee our surplus event funds.
- E. Should a separate funding source such as incremental TOT revenue derived from special events be used to fund event organizers? interesting idea. Worth talking about.

BILL COCKROFT – MMSA

- A. If an event realizes a surplus, should the surplus funds or a portion of the surplus funds be returned to Measure R/U? And if so, what percentage (MLEC guidelines?) of the funds should be returned? *[bcockroft]* Should there be a surplus of funds, this event would be happy to discuss a carry over for future event(s) or return of funds.
- B. Should there be two separate policies for non-profit and for-profit organizations?*[bcockroft]* No, because the assumed differences could be argued for ever. And if so, what would the policies be? For example, in the case of for-profits, should a percentage of funds, equal to the percentage received from Measure U be returned to the fund? And secondly, for non-profit organizations should the designated funds be restricted for a specific purpose?*[bcockroft]* In both cases I believe the fund use is agreed in advance per criteria of the committee.

- C. Should the Performance Report provide greater transparency of event finances that specifically identifies how surplus funds where/will be used by the funding recipient? *[bcockroft]* Yes
- D. Should Town Council have oversight on how the surplus event funds be used for organizations? *[bcockroft]* If there is a surplus clause for events Measure U committee would regulate and advise Town Council.
- E. Should a separate funding source such as incremental TOT revenue derived from special events be used to fund event organizers? *[bcockroft]* Instead of Measure U?

LLOYD CLEARY – Mammoth2Bishop

Stu here is my 2 cents.

On Tuesday, February 12, 2013 the Measure U Application Committee discussed the use of Town funds (Measure R/U) for special events. Action from the meeting was to distribute the 5 questions listed below to funding applicants to gather their thoughts and recommendations.

- A. If an event realizes a surplus, should the surplus funds or a portion of the surplus funds be returned to Measure R/U? And if so, what percentage (MLEC guidelines?) of the funds should be returned? 5, If an event receives a percentage of its budget from measure u funding, it should return the same percentage of profits back into the funding. Example- Budget 100,000 receives 30% of budget from Measure U= \$30,000. The event should pay 30% of profits back to Measure U, up to 30% of the \$30,000 it received from Measure U. So, 30% back of profits up to \$9,000. The event that pays back the percentage of their profits will be allowed to re apply and top of the list for the next Measure U funding cycle.
- B. Should there be two separate polices for non-profit and for-profit organizations? And if so, what would the policies be? For example, in the case of for-profits, should a percentage of funds, equal to the percentage received from Measure U be returned to the fund? And secondly, for non-profit organizations should the designated funds be restricted for a specific purpose? 1, If you follow the rules stated in question A, I believe everyone should pay back the percentage of profits. If you keep taking funding out of measure U and don't make profits, then you are not growing the event and not using the money wisely to make your event more successful.
- C. Should the Performance Report provide greater transparency of event finances that specifically identifies how surplus funds where/will be used by the funding recipient? 5, If the event is receiving Measure U funding and don't pay the proper % back. Then yes. If the event pays back the proper % back to Measure U funding, Then No. it should be at good will, because they already in good faith paid back what is required of them.
- D. Should Town Council have oversight on how the surplus event funds be used for organizations? 5, Same as C.
- E. Should a separate funding source such as incremental TOT revenue derived from special events be used to fund event organizers? 1, Keep it with Measure U and follow, what I stated in question A.

In general, the Committee is also requesting additional ideas and comments from the applicants on how to most efficiently use Measure U funds.

I believe that the funds should only be used to spur up the attendance of the event. Example, use the funding for marketing to draw attendees from outside of town, Use the funding to get better entertainment, which will have a better draw of people.

The funding should not be used for services, like the GPS for the busses. Why? That service will not draw people into the town and increase revenue. If you use The Measure U funding, what it was created for (To increase visitation and income for the TOML). Then you will have funding, for services like this, from the town's increase revenue. I believe Measure U was created to supplement events and help create events to draw visitors to the TOML. Which should the funding be use only for. Not services.

MEASURE U APPLICATION COMMITTEE STAFF REPORT

Subject: Conduct the 2013 Measure U Spring applicant presentations and make funding recommendations for Town Council consideration.

Initiated by: Measure U Application Committee

Written by: Stuart Brown, Recreation Manager

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this item is for the Measure U Application Committee to conduct the 2013 Measure U Spring applicant presentations and make funding recommendations for Town Council consideration on April 3, 2013.

BACKGROUND

On December 5, 2012, Town Council approved the 2013 Measure U Spring Award timeline, funding categories and priorities, and directed the Town Manager to conduct the 2013 Measure U Spring Award. The 2013 Measure U spring application period opened on January 7, and closed on February 1, 2013.

A total of 20 individual funding applications were received for a total request of \$538,135. A list of the organizations requesting funding can be viewed in Attachment A, or for the complete funding applications, visit: <http://www.ci.mammoth-lakes.ca.us/index.aspx?nid=514>

On February 12, 2013, the Committee reviewed the 2013 Measure U spring applications and by consensus, determined that all applications satisfy the Measure U Primary Filter requirements. This included the late application presented by Mammoth Trails for matching Measure R funds for the purchase of special event barricades.

ANALYSIS & DISCUSSION

The Committee by consensus determined the following order of applicant presentations:

1. Town of Mammoth Lakes - Municipal Wayfinding

2. ESTA - NextBus GPS Enhancement
3. Mammoth Track Club - Construction & Programming
4. MMCF/TOML - Mammoth Kamikaze Bike Games
5. SWFFF - Fly Fishing Faire
6. Black Diamond Foods - Mammoth Margarita Festival
7. MLEC - Joint application for Summer Arts & Culture Event support
8. Mammoth Lakes Jazz Jubilee
9. Chamber Music Unbound
10. Mammoth Bluegrass Festival
11. Villagefest
12. Children's Fishing Festival
13. Fiesta Caliente
14. Mammoth Food & Wine
15. Old Mammoth Road Events
16. Mammoth2Bishop Bike Ride
17. Sierra Summer Festival
18. Mammoth Rocks
19. Hop n' Sage
20. Winterburn
21. Mammoth Trails

Applicant Presentations

It was stated by the Committee that each applicant will be limited to a 5 minute presentation and can use the supplied computer/projector for a PowerPoint presentation. The Committee has scheduled 10 minutes per applicant for follow-up questions. All applicants are required to attend. Applicants are not required to use the 5 minute allotment, but the presentation will be timed.

Spring Timeline

Due to the postponement of the February 26, 2013 applicant presentations, staff has revised the spring award timeline. The remaining dates for the 2013 Measure U Spring award are listed below.

- | | |
|---------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Mar. 12 | 2013 Measure U spring applicant presentations and funding recommendations, Suite Z, 8:30AM - 3:30PM. |
| Mar. 13 | Staff compiles Project Filter & Checklists, Committee recommendations, and completes Agenda Bill for Town Council Meeting on April 3, 2013. |
| April 3 | Town Council considers 2013 Measure U spring funding recommendations during regular meeting (no workshop), Suite Z, 6:00PM |

Funding Recommendations

On February 12, 2013, the Measure U Application Committee by consensus determined that each application satisfied the Measure U Primary Filter requirements.

As stated in Step 6 of the Town Council adopted Measure U Funding Process Recommendations, "The Measure U Application Committee uses the Project Filter for evaluation and makes a recommendation to the Town Council for an "up or down" vote of the recommended projects and their applications.

It is the recommendation of the Measure U Committee that if the Town Council does not agree with the U Application Committee project funding recommendations, the Town Council would send the complete set of applications back to the committee with their comments/suggestions. The Measure U Application Committee could reconsider their recommendations and resubmit to the Town Council for approval. The intent of this recommendation is to prevent "cherry-picking" of pet projects and to ensure the projects meeting the established criteria receive requested funding."

Staff is recommending that the Committee review and rate each application by scoring the nine "Project Filters" on a scale of 1-5. The Committee by motion will then make their funding recommendations for the 2013 Measure U Spring Award for Town Council consideration on April 3, 2013.

RECOMMENDATION

Conduct the 2013 Measure U Spring applicant presentations and make funding recommendations for Town Council consideration.



2013 Measure U Spring Award PROJECT FILTER & CHECKLIST

Name of Project: _____ TOTAL SCORE:

Project Category: _____ Organization: _____

Project Type: _____ Measure U Funds Requested: \$ _____

Must Answer "Yes" to all five Primary Filter questions to move to Project Filter section

PRIMARY FILTER	YES	NO
1. Is the project/program for planning, construction, operation, maintenance, programming and administration of facilities, equipment and projects for mobility, recreation or arts & culture?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. The project/program does not supplant existing funds used for the purposes identified above?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Does the project/program meet the goals established by the Town?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Is the project/program identified in the Town's adopted plans?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Did the applicant provide a detailed project/program Conceptual Plan and Economic Analysis?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
PRIMARY FILTER SCORE:	<input style="width: 100px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	

Assign a maximum of 5 points for each of the evaluation criteria listed below in the Project Filter. A perfect score is equal to 45 points. Provide your comments regarding the criteria in the comment field.

PROJECT FILTERS	Low 1	High 5
a). Measurable community benefits	←————→	
b). Limited use or available for year-round use	<input style="width: 100px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	
c). Socio-Economic benefit of project/program	<input style="width: 100px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	
d). Matching or leveraged resources, funds, volunteers, etc.	<input style="width: 100px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	
e). Plan for operation and maintenance of project/program	<input style="width: 100px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	
f). Replacement costs of project/program	<input style="width: 100px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	
g). Location of project	<input style="width: 100px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	
h). Identify Town of Mammoth Lakes goal this seeks to address	<input style="width: 100px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	
i). Project Readiness	<input style="width: 100px; height: 25px;" type="text"/>	

PROJECT FILTER SCORE:

Committee Comments:

Use backside of page for additional comments...