

Project Name Request Amount Reviewer Screening Phase Date of Review Total Score

Mandatory Evaluation Criteria					
SNAP and Virginia Fresh Match programming				Reviewer Score	Please include any notes to clarify scoring.
Excellent	The applicant accepts SNAP/EBT and Fresh Match, or has a detailed plan to begin accepting these benefits. The applicant has a comprehensive SNAP and Fresh Match marketing and promotion strategy to reach targeted communities. If the applicant does not currently accept SNAP/EBT and Fresh Match, they can provide a detailed description of where they are at in the process of becoming a SNAP/EBT and Fresh Match participant.	2			
Good	The applicant mentions SNAP and Fresh Match, but does not provide additional details on usage or intended implementation. The marketing and promotion plan is missing some details. Could use some assistance in reaching targeted communities.	1			
Poor	The applicant rarely, if ever, mentions SNAP and Fresh Match. No detailed plan to implement either program or report on existing usage. No marketing and promotion plan. This renders the application ineligible and the application is disqualified from this grant round.	0			

Mandatory Evaluation Criteria					
Directly serves residents from L/LA communities					Notes
Please include any notes to clarify scoring.					
Excellent	The project will directly and primarily serve a L/LA community.	2			
Good	The project will increase food access in a L/LA, but doing so is not the primary or exclusive purpose of the project. Stronger applications will have a greater focus on L/LA communities and/or increasing the variety and quality of fresh food offerings.	1			
Poor	The project would lead to a relatively modest increase in food access for L/LA communities and/or increased food access is tangential to project.	0			

Mandatory Evaluation Criteria					
Demonstrates a history of community engagement, work in the community, and community support for the project					Notes
Please include any notes to clarify scoring.					
Excellent	The applicant has a clearly established history of work in the community, including, but not limited to: partnerships with local organizations; a community advisory board; participation in community events; etc. The project has demonstrated support from leaders, both formal and informal, in the community.	2			
Good	The applicant is relatively new to the community or is not deeply involved, but is knowledgeable on issues central to the community. The applicant has engaged in outreach with local community leaders, both formal and informal, and has support for the project.	1			
Poor	The applicant has a limited history with, or no major connections with or to the community.	0			

Mandatory Evaluation Criteria					
Purchases a significant volume of fresh products from Virginia's small, beginning, limited resource, Veteran, and/or socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers					Notes
Please include any notes to clarify scoring.					
Excellent	Clear vision/plan to source a significant amount of produce from Virginia's small, beginning, limited resource, Veteran, and/or socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers. The applicant has established relationships or a detailed producer engagement strategy.	2			
Good	For existing businesses: the applicant does not currently source a significant amount of fresh products from Virginia's small, beginning, limited resource, Veteran, and/or socially disadvantaged producers. The application mentions producers, but there is no evidence of a clear plan for sourcing. For new businesses: the applicant has a plan to source a significant amount of fresh products from Virginia's small, beginning, limited resource, Veteran, and/or socially disadvantaged producers, but details are missing and/or the plan is not clear.	1			
Poor	The applicant has no clear plan to purchase fresh products from Virginia's small, beginning, limited resource, Veteran, and/or socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers.	0			

Additional Evaluation Criteria					
					Notes

Is owned or substantially led by individuals from low-income, low-access communities, or is working in an active, ongoing partnership with these individuals, to include shared leadership, decision-making, resources, and/or shared economic benefit, etc.				Please include any notes to clarify scoring.
Excellent	Applicant individuals or organizations are from LI/LA communities or is majority-run and/or is actively partnered with individuals from the these communities. For partnerships, the applicant must show that this is an active, ongoing partnership with shared decision-making and that the partner shares in the project's economic benefit.	2		
Good	The applicant individual or organization is not from a LI/LA community or individuals from this community constitute a minority of leadership and/or the business plan includes a plan to partner with individuals or organizations from a LI/LA community. For applicants intending to partner with these organizations or individuals, these organizations or individuals must already be identified and prepared to actively engage in the project.	1		
Poor	Applicant individuals or organization is not from a LI/LA community, and these communities are not part of the ownership or leadership, nor involved in the project in any meaningful way.	0		
Additional Evaluation Criteria				Notes
The Project's ethos and mission reflects the community and its customers, and is clearly rooted in the place it serves. Examples: a co-op; a unique mission; local artistry, murals, etc.; a VA-based business.				Please include any notes to clarify scoring.
Excellent	The applicant currently incorporates methods of expressing the culture, arts, and history of the community in its business plan. Examples include: the applicant works with BIPOC community leaders to inform the project and to create a culturally relevant and place-based experience; the store is a co-op with a unique mission; the business is VA-based; etc. The community is reflected in the project.	2		
Good	The applicant has not yet begun to incorporate methods of expressing the culture, arts, and history of the community in its business plan. The applicant has not begun to work with BIPOC community leaders to inform the project and to create a culturally relevant and place-based experience.	1		
Poor	The applicant does not have a plan to incorporate the culture, arts, and history of the community into its business plan. The community is not reflected in the project.	0		
Additional Evaluation Criteria				Notes
Supports new enterprises and creates wealth in LI/LA communities, creating real and sustainable economic opportunities for its members.				Please include any notes to clarify scoring.
Excellent	The project's success will directly lead to new, enhanced income opportunities for members of LI/LA communities, creating community wealth over time.	2		
Good	The project creates limited or indirect income and wealth building opportunities for LI/LA communities.	1		
Poor	The project offers no wealth building opportunities for LI/LA communities.	0		
Additional Evaluation Criteria				Notes
Provides positive outcomes to the community, including education, leadership and youth development, employment of community residents, job training, or workforce development				Please include any notes to clarify scoring.
Excellent	The applicant has clearly identified benefit(s) to the community, such as reserving a certain number of jobs for residents and providing internships/training for youth. Strong applications will clearly demonstrate methods and timelines for attaining outcomes and will show how they are using models with proven success.	2		
Good	The applicant intends to add community benefit(s) to the business plan but has not yet fully identified the manner or timeline.	1		
Poor	The applicant provides no plan for adding community benefit(s) to the business plan.	0		
Additional Evaluation Criteria				Notes
Demonstrates success in creating partnerships and/or efforts to leverage additional funding (i.e. leverages additional resources) that may advance project sustainability.				Please include any notes to clarify scoring.
Excellent	The applicant has well established partnerships or a defined plan to create partnerships that will bring additional resources to help ensure the project's success. Strong applications will show that potential partners have already been identified and that they support the project.	2		

Good	The applicant has tentative plans to create partnerships but does not have relationships in place or letters of support from potential partners.	1		
Poor	The applicant has no existing partnerships or plans to create partnerships.	0		
Additional Evaluation Criteria				Notes
Budget and Financial Planning				Please include any notes to clarify scoring.
Excellent	The budget and budget narrative are clearly articulated, aligned with program goals, and include only allowable uses of funds. If the project is part of a larger project, the applicant has provided a sources and uses document.	2		
Good	Some of the budget and/or budget narrative is unclear. Mostly aligned with program goals. Some unallowable costs.	1		
Poor	The budget and budget narrative are unclear, not aligned with program goals, and/or include unallowable costs.	0		
Additional Evaluation Criteria				Notes
Project Management and Implementation				Please include any notes to clarify scoring.
Excellent	Detailed, realistic work plan with clear timelines. Qualified project team with relevant experience.	2		
Good	The workplan seems ambitious or is unclear, and/or the project team may not be lacking. The applicant may need to revise the workplan and seek out technical assistance or coaching.	1		
Poor	The workplan is unclear and unmanageable. The project team is unidentified or the team lacks relevant skills to successfully operate a large-scale grocery retailer.	0		
Additional Evaluation Criteria				Notes
Please use this space for any additional feedback not captured in the scoring rubric. Use of additional criteria may shed light on an applicant's potential for success and include rating criteria such as: expressed passion for the project, potential for success, clarity of ideas, clear and concise use of resources, innovation in addressing transportation barriers, potential for replication and scaling, etc.				Please include any notes to clarify scoring.
Project passion: the applicant(s) have articulated the "why" of the project from a holistic standpoint, taking into account the community's wants and needs, the greater food ecosystem, and their role in advancing these outcomes		0-2		
Appropriate allocation of funds for equipment/infrastructure. Prioritizing equipment/infrastructure for SNAP-eligible food products. Clear connection between capital investments and community benefit.		0-2		
Clearly articulated community support (as evidenced by relevant letters of support, testimonials, or interviews) and developed relationships with key partners		0-2		
Project's likelihood of success: The applicant has demonstrated their ability to successfully implement the project and carry out the terms of the grant. This can include the applicant's past success in carrying out something similar, the support of strong partners, demonstrated funding and staff to implement the project, and other past actions or attributes.		0-2		