2019 AML Pilot Project Scoring Matrix

	Excellent, Outstanding, or Very Good (8-10 points per box)	**Good, Strong, or Adequate (5-7 points per box)**	**Poor, Weak, or Inadequate (1-4 points per box)**
A)	*Expected Outcome:* ● Very likely to result in favorable economic or community development outcomes ● Very likely to generate ancillary businesses	*Expected Outcome:* ● Somewhat likely to result in favorable economic or community development outcomes ● Somewhat likely to generate ancillary businesses	*Expected Outcome:* ● Not likely to result in favorable economic or community development outcomes ● Unlikely to generate ancillary businesses
B)	*Return on Investment:* ● Project will have very significant and far-reaching impact on enhancing the coalfield region and its residents with high ROI if proposed outcomes achieved within budget ● Impact would extend beyond those directly served and would be long lasting	*Return on Investment:* ● The project would offer broad benefit to the community, but it's not evident overall impact will be that significant in terms of people affected or lasting change achieved.	*Return on Investment:* ● Project is unlikely to have any significant impact ● There would be no or very little return on investment
C)	*Strategy / Feasibility:* ● Project has clear goals, and presents a solid innovative strategy for achieving them ● Well-thought-out timeline and evidence-based techniques ● Necessary organization capacity is in place to successfully complete the project	*Strategy / Feasibility:* ● Project includes realistic goals relevant to identified need ● Timeline and strategy less developed, but reasonably feasible ● Work proposed to achieve goals less innovative.	*Strategy / Feasibility:* ● Poorly defined goals and/or does not include realistic or effective strategies to achieve intended goals ● Goals don't relate well to the need identified ● Project unlikely to succeed
D)	*Sustainability:* ● Viable plan to cover long-term operation and maintenance costs ● Project will clearly be self-sustaining after completion	*Sustainability:* ● Plan to cover long-term operation and maintenance costs is less certain/clear ● Project might be self-sustaining after completion or will rely on continued public funding	*Sustainability:* ● No plan to cover long-term operation and maintenance costs ● Project will not be self-sustaining after completion
E)	*Partnerships:* ● Strong evidence of viable community partners	*Partnerships:* ● Some evidence of viable community partners	*Partnerships:* ● Weak evidence of viable community partners
F)	*Funding Sources:* ● Additional funding sources already secured to enhance scope of project	*Funding Sources:* ● Additional funding sources identified or applied for, but not yet secured	*Funding Sources:* ● No additional funding indicated

Revised 12-09-2019

G)	*Area/Population Served:* ● Project has regional or widespread impact ● Project serves broad based population	*Area/Population Served:* ● Project impacts population of moderate geographic area ● Project serves a small sector of the population	*Area/Population Served:* ● Project impact limited to very small population or sector ● Project serves a limited sector of the population
H)	*Immediacy of Impact:* ● Impacts will be realized within 1 year following project completion	*Immediacy of Impact:* ● Impact in 2-3 years following project completion	*Immediacy of Impact:* ● Impacts will be realized 4+ years following project completion
I)	*Impact Indicators:* ● Performance measures clearly stated ● Method to evaluate results of project clearly stated	*Impact Indicators:* ● Performance measures adequately stated ● Method to evaluate results of project adequately stated	*Impact Indicators:* ● Performance measures poorly stated ● No method to evaluate results of the project
BONUS) ***+5 if these criteria are met:*** *Reclamation Activities* ● Project includes direct or incidental reclamation of AML features ● Mitigates hazards and/or has positive environmental impact			