Applicant	Sage YMCA, YMCA of Metropolitan Chicago
Project Title	Sage YMCA Summer Camp and Child Care Financial Assistance Program
Fund Request	$680,000
Contact	Adriana Reyneri
Review Date	7/13/2022
Reviewer	Jake Yalowitz

ADVANCE McHenry County

Total Composite Score
90.00

Eligibility	Question	Response	Notes
Eligibility	Is this project eligible for ARPA funds?	Yes	Yes, structured summer programs with educational components are responsive, eligible programs under EC 2.27
Concerns	Are there any concerns or uncertainties regarding the eligibility designation?		No, but since child care is not the most appropriate expenditure category, it may be helpful to remove this section of the project name
Category	What is this project's Expenditure Category? (*Select below*)		
	2. Negative Economic Impacts		2.27 Addressing Impacts of Lost Instructional Time ^
Proceed?	**Proceed to next section**		

Criteria	Evaluator Instructions	Questions of Interest	Review Notes	Possible Score	Actual Score
Impact vs. Effort	Impact and Effort will be given scores from 1-20. The composite score will be calculated by adding scores for both measures, ranked 0-10 respectively. Reference: Application Section B • Question 2 • Question 4	How much value or impact will the outcomes have on the County? How much time, money, resources, and capacity will be needed to achieve the desired outcome?	Allowing 100 low-income youth the opportunity to attend summer day camp will be incredibly high impact, with effort being medium low due to the cost of the program	20	17
		Impact Score (1-10, low-high):	10		
		Effort Score (1-10, high-low):	7		
Budget	Each project assessment will include a budget review by the McHenry County project team, resulting in a score of 0-15 on the Evaluation Rubric. Documentation will include the submitted project budget and review notes from the project team. **Reference**: **Project applicant Budget Form** **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 2** **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 8**	Does this project have a detailed and realistic budget?	The budget is detailed and realistic, but needs to be cleaned up to be clearer. Project receives full points because the reviewer was able to decipher it, but budget must be redone before a potential approval	15	15
Fiscal Sustainability	This review will be based on documentation from the project application in Section 3: Budget and Finance, with a score of 0-10 (low – high) assigned to indicate the strength of the program's long-term sustainability. **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 6** **Reference: Application Section F** **• Question 4**	Will the project be able to continue when ARPA funds are exhausted without other general revenue funds?	No solutions to fiscal sustainability were offered - this would be a temporary bump in programming that would respond to the pandemic	10	3
Risk	The program team will consider additional risks, detailing costs, benefits, and unknowns in the project review template and assigning a score risk acceptability ranging from 0-10 (low – high). **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 1** **• Question 2**	Is this project of an acceptable risk level? Does it pose uncertainties regarding outcomes or unintended consequences?	No identified uncertainties	10	10

Performance Tracking	By tracking the progress, outcomes, strengths, and areas for improvement against user-defined benchmarks. Each application will be assessed on a 0 – 10 scale to indicate the strength of these measures. **Reference: Application Section B** **• Question 3**	Does this project have a comprehensive set of goals and aligned data tracking supports?	Great KPIs and data tracking goals, but current/expected output have to be edited to show growth. Easy fix.	10	10
Leveraged Funds	Each project is measured on a scale of 0-10, with a 0 indicating a project that's completely reliant on ARPA funds. For smaller community-based organizations, this item may be removed for certain projects when it is either irrelevant to a proposal's goals or unfeasible due to logistical constraints. **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 3** **• Question 4** **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 6** **• Question 7**	Is subrecipient able to combine non-ARPA funds to support project?	Significant matching funds, as the program already exists. ARPA funding would augment current staff/grant capacity	10	10
Equity	Applications will be assessed on a 0 – 10 scale (low – high) to measure the strength of equitable program design, user accommodations, geographic location, and other indicators of inclusivity and intentional support of disadvantaged communities. **Reference: Application Section F** **• Question 1** **• Question 2** **• Question 3** **• Question 4** **• Question 7**	Does this project meet the needs of historically disinvested communities?	Yes, it targets low-income youth for education/growth opportunities they would be unable to leverage without ARPA funding	10	10
Evidence Based	For each of the categories where documentation is required, as noted on the County's project application form, the ARPA review committee will assess a score from 0-10 based on the strength of the submitted documentation. **Reference: Application Section G** **• Question 1** **• Question 2** **• Question 3** **• Question 4**	Does this project use intervention(s) supported by evidence?	Evidence-based practices from the American Camp Association are incorporated into program design	10	10
Other Funding	Compare project to McHenry's government grant database maintained by Bronner. Note any alternative funding opportunities. **Reference: McHenry Federal Funds Tracker** **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 5**	Is this project unlikely to be funded without CSLFRF dollars?	Yes	5	5
Total				**100**	**90**

Applicant	Kids in Need of McHenry County
Project Title	KIN Visitation Home and Resources
Fund Request	$142,100
Contact	Michelle Prickett
Review Date	7/6/2022
Reviewer	Jake Yalowitz

ADVANCE McHenry County

Total Composite Score
84.00

Eligibility	Question	Response	Notes
Eligibility	Is this project eligible for ARPA funds?	Yes	
Concerns	Are there any concerns or uncertainties regarding the eligibility designation?	Yes	Kids in Need (KIN) McHenry County is requesting $142,100 for rent, program costs, and supplies to support a newly created visitation home that facilitates court-ordered child/parent visits. As services to foster youth and families involved in the child welfare system are enumerated uses, this funding of the KIN visitation home would be an eligible ARPA expense. We would need to look more closely at the eligibility of the scholarship portion of the program in which KIN provides scholarships to parents who are homeless, on disability or are in financial distress, but are court ordered to do their visits with their child at the KIN Home for safety reasons. Additionally, the application mentions edge cases in which the house was used to host visitation for parents/children outside of the court/welfare system. We need to ensure that these occurences fall below a de minimis rate of occurence to confirm ARPA compliance. The project is currently underway, so the need for ARPA funding has not been clearly demonstrated
Category	What is this project's Expenditure Category? (*Select below*)		$3,000 discrepancy between submitted budget and request.
	2. Negative Economic Impacts		2.13 Healthy Childhood Environments: Services to Foster Youth or Families Involved in Child Welfare System *^
Proceed?	**Proceed - review uncertainties with project team**		

Criteria	Evaluator Instructions	Questions of Interest	Review Notes	Possible Score	Actual Score
Impact vs. Effort	Impact and Effort will be given scores from 1-20. The composite score will be calculated by adding scores for both measures, ranked 0-10 respectively. Reference: Application Section B • Question 2 • Question 4	How much value or impact will the outcomes have on the County? How much time, money, resources, and capacity will be needed to achieve the desired outcome?	Medium - high impact, low effort	20	16
		Impact Score (1-10, low-high):	7		
		Effort Score (1-10, high-low):	9		
Budget	Each project assessment will include a budget review by the McHenry County project team, resulting in a score of 0-15 on the Evaluation Rubric. Documentation will include the submitted project budget and review notes from the project team. **Reference**: **Project applicant Budget Form** **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 2** **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 8**	Does this project have a detailed and realistic budget?	Yes	15	15
Fiscal Sustainability	This review will be based on documentation from the project application in Section 3: Budget and Finance, with a score of 0-10 (low – high) assigned to indicate the strength of the program's long-term sustainability. **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 6** **Reference: Application Section F** **• Question 4**	Will the project be able to continue when ARPA funds are exhausted without other general revenue funds?	There is a rough plan for fiscal sustainability post-ARPA funding, but this plan relies on support from many organizations.	10	6

Risk	The program team will consider additional risks, detailing costs, benefits, and unknowns in the project review template and assigning a score risk acceptability ranging from 0-10 (low – high). **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 1** **• Question 2**	Is this project of an acceptable risk level? Does it pose uncertainties regarding outcomes or unintended consequences?	Only risk immediately identified is services being provided to recipients outside of the county or outside of foster system/court system	10	9
Performance Tracking	By tracking the progress, outcomes, strengths, and areas for improvement against user-defined benchmarks. Each application will be assessed on a 0 – 10 scale to indicate the strength of these measures. **Reference: Application Section B** **• Question 3**	Does this project have a comprehensive set of goals and aligned data tracking supports?	Great KPIs	10	10
Leveraged Funds	Each project is measured on a scale of 0-10, with a 0 indicating a project that's completely reliant on ARPA funds. For smaller community-based organizations, this item may be removed for certain projects when it is either irrelevant to a proposal's goals or unfeasible due to logistical constraints. **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 3** **• Question 4** **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 6** **• Question 7**	Is subrecipient able to combine non-ARPA funds to support project?	KIN is providing employee salaries and costs and maintenance of the property, but these costs are not quantified nor included in the budget	10	6
Equity	Applications will be assessed on a 0 – 10 scale (low – high) to measure the strength of equitable program design, user accommodations, geographic location, and other indicators of inclusivity and intentional support of disadvantaged communities. **Reference: Application Section F** **• Question 1** **• Question 2** **• Question 3** **• Question 4** **• Question 7**	Does this project meet the needs of historically disinvested communities?	yes, welfare-involved families are primarily from underserved communities	10	10
Evidence Based	For each of the categories where documentation is required, as noted on the County's project application form, the ARPA review committee will assess a score from 0-10 based on the strength of the submitted documentation. **Reference: Application Section G** **• Question 1** **• Question 2** **• Question 3** **• Question 4**	Does this project use intervention(s) supported by evidence?	yes, ROAN utilizes evidence-based praticices in family visitations	10	10
Other Funding	Compare project to McHenry's government grant database maintained by Bronner. Note any alternative funding opportunities. **Reference: McHenry Federal Funds Tracker** **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 5**	Is this project unlikely to be funded without CSLFRF dollars?	This is unclear, as the project is currently underway, so the need for ARPA funding has not been clearly demonstrated	5	2
Total				**100**	**84**

Applicant	Family Health Partnership Clinic
Project Title	Social Determinants of Health
Fund Request	$256,332
Contact	Suzanne Hoban
Review Date	6/10/2022
Reviewer	Jake Yalowitz

ADVANCE McHenry County

Total Composite Score
81.00

Eligibility	Question	Response	Notes
Eligibility	Is this project eligible for ARPA funds?	Yes	This project is a likely eligible expense, as community health workers are an enumerated eligible use. A complication, though, is that the specific expenditure category requires that eligible uses primarily serve disproportionately impacted communities. The focus of this program on the uninsured population likely meets this threshold, but income data should be referenced to see if primary beneficiaries are below 185% Federal Poverty Guidelines or 45% County AMI. The proposal should be lightly edited to discuss pandemic harm, and show that the proposed services will be responsive to the negative public health impact on the program's intended beneficiaries.
Concerns	Are there any concerns or uncertainties regarding the eligibility designation?	Yes	Most concerns are discussed above. We should meet with the applicant to review budget costs to ensure that non-salary expenditures are directly related to serving the intended community. Must confirm that there will be no program income from the services performed by the ARPA-funded workers. Need to discuss project budget in greater detail to understand in-kind contributions.
Category	What is this project's Expenditure Category? (*Select below*)		
	2. Negative Economic Impacts		2.19 Social Determinants of Health: Community Health Workers or Benefits Navigators *^
Proceed?	**Proceed - review uncertainties with project team**		

Criteria	Evaluator Instructions	Questions of Interest	Review Notes	Possible Score	Actual Score
Impact vs. Effort	Impact and Effort will be given scores from 1-20. The composite score will be calculated by adding scores for both measures, ranked 0-10 respectively. Reference: Application Section B • Question 2 • Question 4	How much value or impact will the outcomes have on the County? How much time, money, resources, and capacity will be needed to achieve the desired outcome?	High impact to the ~350 individuals served by the clinic yearly, with medium low effort	20	16
		Impact Score (1-10, low-high):	9		
		Effort Score (1-10, high-low):	7		
Budget	Each project assessment will include a budget review by the McHenry County project team, resulting in a score of 0-15 on the Evaluation Rubric. Documentation will include the submitted project budget and review notes from the project team. **Reference: Project applicant Budget Form** **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 2** **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 8**	Does this project have a detailed and realistic budget?	yes	15	15
Fiscal Sustainability	This review will be based on documentation from the project application in Section 3: Budget and Finance, with a score of 0-10 (low – high) assigned to indicate the strength of the program's long-term sustainability. **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 6** **Reference: Application Section F** **• Question 4**	Will the project be able to continue when ARPA funds are exhausted without other general revenue funds?	Applicant states that they have experience replacing grant funds, but does not propose a plan for doing so with this program	10	6
Risk	The program team will consider additional risks, detailing costs, benefits, and unknowns in the project review template and assigning a score risk acceptability ranging from 0-10 (low – high). **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 1** **• Question 2**	Is this project of an acceptable risk level? Does it pose uncertainties regarding outcomes or unintended consequences?	So long as the County has a reasonable level of confidence that this program is primarily serving disproportionately impacted communities, compliance risks are minimal. Must confirm that there will be no program income from the services performed by the ARPA-funded workers.	10	9
Performance Tracking	By tracking the progress, outcomes, strengths, and areas for improvement against user-defined benchmarks. Each application will be assessed on a 0 – 10 scale to indicate the strength of these measures. **Reference: Application Section B** **• Question 3**	Does this project have a comprehensive set of goals and aligned data tracking supports?	Great KPIs	10	10

Leveraged Funds	Each project is measured on a scale of 0-10, with a 0 indicating a project that's completely reliant on ARPA funds. For smaller community-based organizations, this item may be removed for certain projects when it is either irrelevant to a proposal's goals or unfeasible due to logistical constraints. **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 3** **• Question 4** **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 6** **• Question 7**	Is subrecipient able to combine non-ARPA funds to support project?	significant in-kind contributions, but unclear how related they are to this specific program	10	6
Equity	Applications will be assessed on a 0 – 10 scale (low – high) to measure the strength of equitable program design, user accommodations, geographic location, and other indicators of inclusivity and intentional support of disadvantaged communities. **Reference: Application Section F** **• Question 1** **• Question 2** **• Question 3** **• Question 4** **• Question 7**	Does this project meet the needs of historically disinvested communities?	Yes	10	10
Evidence Based	For each of the categories where documentation is required, as noted on the County's project application form, the ARPA review committee will assess a score from 0-10 based on the strength of the submitted documentation. **Reference: Application Section G** **• Question 1** **• Question 2** **• Question 3** **• Question 4**	Does this project use intervention(s) supported by evidence?	Significant evidence base is referenced, but need to make sure this is directly connected to the design of the program, which is not currently clear	10	6
Other Funding	Compare project to McHenry's government grant database maintained by Bronner. Note any alternative funding opportunities. **Reference: McHenry Federal Funds Tracker** **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 5**	Is this project unlikely to be funded without CSLFRF dollars?	Unlikely to be funded outside of ARPA without significant philanthropic funding	5	3
Total				**100**	**81**

Applicant	Woodstock Fire/Rescue District
Project Title	WFRD-Ambulance
Fund Request	$361,000
Contact	Michael Hill
Review Date	7/7/2022
Reviewer	Alex Iseri

ADVANCE McHenry County

Total Composite Score
80.00

Eligibility	Question	Response	Notes
Eligibility	Is this project eligible for ARPA funds?	Yes	This project proposes ARPA funding to add an additional ambulance to the Woodstock Fire/Rescue District Fleet due to increased demand for service as a result of the pandemic. This project is an enumerated eligible use under the Final Rule, and should be categorized as EC 1.14: Other Public Health Services. The project would have to follow Uniform Guidance regulations surrounding the method of procurement, as this is a purchase over the $250,000 threshold, with all federal grants managements requirements flowing down to the Fire Protection District as a subrecipient. Per Treasury Final Rule pg. 60-61: "In recognition of the importance of capital expenditures in the COVID-19 public health response, Treasury enumerates that the following projects are examples of eligible capital expenditures, as long as they meet the standards for capital expenditures in section Capital Expenditures in General Provisions: Other:...Acquisition of equipment for COVID-19 prevention and treatment, including ventilators, ambulances, and other medical or emergency services equipment" An ambulance satisfies both pre-conditions (identification and responsiveness to negative public health impact) for a capital expenditure articulated in the Final Rule. Due to the pandemic's effect on demand for public health services, demand for ambulance services increased, which had a direct impact on response times which directly effects patient outcomes. By purchasing an additional ambulance, this proposed investment would directly and proportionally respond to this increased, pandemic-related public health need.
Concerns	Are there any concerns or uncertainties regarding the eligibility designation?		Ambulance must be disposed of in a way that is consistent with Uniform Guidance.
Category	What is this project's Expenditure Category? (*Select below*)		
	1. Public Health		1.14 Other Public Health Services ^
Proceed?	**Proceed to next section**		

Criteria	Evaluator Instructions	Questions of Interest	Review Notes	Possible Score	Actual Score
Impact vs. Effort	Impact and Effort will be given scores from 1-20. The composite score will be calculated by adding scores for both measures, ranked 0-10 respectively. Reference: Application Section B • Question 2 • Question 4	How much value or impact will the outcomes have on the County? How much time, money, resources, and capacity will be needed to achieve the desired outcome?	High impact due to public health benefit sustainability of investment. Low effort due to low purchase costs and reasonableness of expenditure.	20	14
		Impact Score (1-10, low-high):	7		
		Effort Score (1-10, high-low):	7		
Budget	Each project assessment will include a budget review by the McHenry County project team, resulting in a score of 0-15 on the Evaluation Rubric. Documentation will include the submitted project budget and review notes from the project team. **Reference**: **Project applicant Budget Form** **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 2** **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 8**	Does this project have a detailed and realistic budget?	Budget is complete and detailed. Should include staffing costs as well, in addition to soft costs.	15	14

Fiscal Sustainability	This review will be based on documentation from the project application in Section 3: Budget and Finance, with a score of 0-10 (low – high) assigned to indicate the strength of the program's long-term sustainability. **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 6** **Reference: Application Section F** **• Question 4**	Will the project be able to continue when ARPA funds are exhausted without other general revenue funds?	Unclear what funds are going to be used to staff and maintain the ambulance, or replace the ambulance to maintain the new level of service- is there a budet surplus?	10	8
Risk	The program team will consider additional risks, detailing costs, benefits, and unknowns in the project review template and assigning a score risk acceptability ranging from 0-10 (low – high). **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 1** **• Question 2**	Is this project of an acceptable risk level? Does it pose uncertainties regarding outcomes or unintended consequences?	No immediate risk identified- most significant future risk is that ambulance must be disposed of in a way that is consistent with UG.	10	10
Performance Tracking	By tracking the progress, outcomes, strengths, and areas for improvement against user-defined benchmarks. Each application will be assessed on a 0 – 10 scale to indicate the strength of these measures. **Reference: Application Section B** **• Question 3**	Does this project have a comprehensive set of goals and aligned data tracking supports?	Please include KPIs (G3) for items 1 and 3 (section G4) in resubmission.	10	7
Leveraged Funds	Each project is measured on a scale of 0-10, with a 0 indicating a project that's completely reliant on ARPA funds. For smaller community-based organizations, this item may be removed for certain projects when it is either irrelevant to a proposal's goals or unfeasible due to logistical constraints. **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 3** **• Question 4** **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 6** **• Question 7**	Is subrecipient able to combine non-ARPA funds to support project?	$31,000 contributed by applicant to project (10.6% total project cost).	10	8
Equity	Applications will be assessed on a 0 – 10 scale (low – high) to measure the strength of equitable program design, user accommodations, geographic location, and other indicators of inclusivity and intentional support of disadvantaged communities. **Reference: Application Section F** **• Question 1** **• Question 2** **• Question 3** **• Question 4** **• Question 7**	Does this project meet the needs of historically disinvested communities?	Yes, applicant has indicated that primary intended beneficiaries earn under 60% of median income in McHenry County. Treasury identifies individuals in this group as disproportionately affected by COVID-19.	10	10
Evidence Based	For each of the categories where documentation is required, as noted on the County's project application form, the ARPA review committee will assess a score from 0-10 based on the strength of the submitted documentation. **Reference: Application Section G** **• Question 1** **• Question 2** **• Question 3** **• Question 4**	Does this project use intervention(s) supported by evidence?	Please identify a peer reviewed study or other evidence based document related specifically to the importance of ambulance response time in the treatment/mitigation/prevention of COVID-19.	10	7

Other Funding	Compare project to McHenry's government grant database maintained by Bronner. Note any alternative funding opportunities. **Reference: McHenry Federal Funds Tracker** **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 5**	Is this project unlikely to be funded without CSLFRF dollars?	Applicant identified the FEMA "Assistance to Firefighters" grant as another funding source for ambulance purchase. In FY21, FEMA designated $11.5 million for ambulance purchase proposals.	5	2
Total				**100**	**80**

Applicant	Cary Fire Protection District
Project Title	Ambulance
Fund Request	$339,483
Contact	Brad Delatorre
Review Date	7/7/2022
Reviewer	Alex Iseri

ADVANCE McHenry County

Total Composite Score
80.00

Eligibility	Question	Response	Notes
Eligibility	Is this project eligible for ARPA funds?	Yes	This project proposes ARPA funding to add an additional ambulance to the Cary Fire Protection District Fleet due to increased demand for service as a result of the pandemic. This project is an enumerated eligible use under the Final Rule, and should be categorized as EC 1.14: Other Public Health Services. The project would have to follow Uniform Guidance regulations surrounding the method of procurement, as this is a purchase over the $250,000 threshold, with all federal grants managements requirements flowing down to the Fire Protection District as a subrecipient. Per Treasury Final Rule pg. 60-61: "In recognition of the importance of capital expenditures in the COVID-19 public health response, Treasury enumerates that the following projects are examples of eligible capital expenditures, as long as they meet the standards for capital expenditures in section Capital Expenditures in General Provisions: Other:...Acquisition of equipment for COVID-19 prevention and treatment, including ventilators, ambulances, and other medical or emergency services equipment" An ambulance satisfies both pre-conditions (identification and responsiveness to negative public health impact) for a capital expenditure articulated in the Final Rule. Due to the pandemic's effect on demand for public health services, demand for ambulance services increased, which had a direct impact on response times which directly effects patient outcomes. By purchasing an additional ambulance, this proposed investment would directly and proportionally respond to this increased, pandemic-related public health need.
Concerns	Are there any concerns or uncertainties regarding the eligibility designation?	Yes	Ambulance must be disposed of in a way that is consistent with Uniform Guidance.
Category	What is this project's Expenditure Category? (*Select below*)		
	2. Negative Economic Impacts		2.34 Assistance to Impacted Nonprofit Organizations (Impacted or Disproportionately Impac
Proceed?	**Proceed - review uncertainties with project team**		

Criteria	Evaluator Instructions	Questions of Interest	Review Notes	Possible Score	Actual Score
Impact vs. Effort	Impact and Effort will be given scores from 1-20. The composite score will be calculated by adding scores for both measures, ranked 0-10 respectively. Reference: Application Section B • Question 2 • Question 4	How much value or impact will the outcomes have on the County? How much time, money, resources, and capacity will be needed to achieve the desired outcome?	High impact due to public health benefit sustainability of investment. Low effort due to low purchase costs and reasonableness of expenditure.	20	14
		Impact Score (1-10, low-high):	7		
		Effort Score (1-10, high-low):	7		
Budget	Each project assessment will include a budget review by the McHenry County project team, resulting in a score of 0-15 on the Evaluation Rubric. Documentation will include the submitted project budget and review notes from the project team. **Reference**: **Project applicant Budget Form** **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 2** **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 8**	Does this project have a detailed and realistic budget?	Budget is complete and detailed. Should include staffing costs as well, in addition to soft costs.	15	14

Fiscal Sustainability	This review will be based on documentation from the project application in Section 3: Budget and Finance, with a score of 0-10 (low – high) assigned to indicate the strength of the program's long-term sustainability. **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 6** **Reference: Application Section F** **• Question 4**	Will the project be able to continue when ARPA funds are exhausted without other general revenue funds?	Unclear what funds are going to be used to staff and maintain the ambulance, or replace the ambulance to maintain the new level of service- is there a budet surplus?	10	8
Risk	The program team will consider additional risks, detailing costs, benefits, and unknowns in the project review template and assigning a score risk acceptability ranging from 0-10 (low – high). **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 1** **• Question 2**	Is this project of an acceptable risk level? Does it pose uncertainties regarding outcomes or unintended consequences?	No immediate risk identified- most significant future risk is that ambulance must be disposed of in a way that is consistent with UG.	10	10
Performance Tracking	By tracking the progress, outcomes, strengths, and areas for improvement against user-defined benchmarks. Each application will be assessed on a 0 – 10 scale to indicate the strength of these measures. **Reference: Application Section B** **• Question 3**	Does this project have a comprehensive set of goals and aligned data tracking supports?	Please include KPIs (G3) for items 1, 3, and 7 (section G4) in resubmission.	10	8
Leveraged Funds	Each project is measured on a scale of 0-10, with a 0 indicating a project that's completely reliant on ARPA funds. For smaller community-based organizations, this item may be removed for certain projects when it is either irrelevant to a proposal's goals or unfeasible due to logistical constraints. **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 3** **• Question 4** **Reference: Application Section H** **• Question 6** **• Question 7**	Is subrecipient able to combine non-ARPA funds to support project?	$36,221 contributed by applicant to project (9.6% total project cost).	10	8
Equity	Applications will be assessed on a 0 – 10 scale (low – high) to measure the strength of equitable program design, user accommodations, geographic location, and other indicators of inclusivity and intentional support of disadvantaged communities. **Reference: Application Section F** **• Question 1** **• Question 2** **• Question 3** **• Question 4** **• Question 7**	Does this project meet the needs of historically disinvested communities?	Number of beneficiaries from historically underserved or marginalized communities is very unclear.	10	9
Evidence Based	For each of the categories where documentation is required, as noted on the County's project application form, the ARPA review committee will assess a score from 0-10 based on the strength of the submitted documentation. **Reference: Application Section G** **• Question 1** **• Question 2** **• Question 3** **• Question 4**	Does this project use intervention(s) supported by evidence?	Please identify a peer reviewed study or other evidence based document related specifically to the importance of ambulance response time in the treatment/mitigation/prevention of COVID-19.	10	7

Other Funding	Compare project to McHenry's government grant database maintained by Bronner. Note any alternative funding opportunities. **Reference: McHenry Federal Funds Tracker** **Reference: Application Section C** **• Question 5**	Is this project unlikely to be funded without CSLFRF dollars?	Applicant identified the FEMA "Assistance to Firefighters" grant as another funding source for ambulance purchase. In FY21, FEMA designated $11.5 million for ambulance purchase proposals.	5	2
Total				**100**	**80**