

Application Guide Addendum (For 2021-01)

P. 2

Southeast Specialist – 303-866-3537
Southeast Contracts – Breanne Nugent
Survey Contracts – Korbin Pugh
Outreach – Sara Doll
Public Relations – Philip Clapham
Leadville - Janell Keyser

P. 6

Addition of the Survey Planning grant
Max Award is now \$15,000 (no additional funds are available)

P.7

Announcement Dates for \$35,000 or less is now May 1 and November 1

P.10

This is the new Property Protection Matrix.

Owner Type	Public	Non-Profit	Private/For-Profit
Total grant awards			
\$0 - 25,000	No restrictions	No restrictions	No restrictions
\$25,001 - 100,000	10-year LOA	10-year LOA	10-year LOA
\$100,001 - 250,000	20-year Covenant	20-year Covenant	20-year Covenant
Acquisition	Easement	Easement	Easement
\$250,001 and over			Easement
\$250,001 - 500,000	Restart 20-year Covenant	Restart 20-year Covenant	
\$500,001 and over		Easement	
Every additional \$250,000	Restart 20-year Covenant		

Please note that if your property already has a recorded covenant or easement, there will not be a retro-active application of the new matrix. (I.e. if you currently have a recorded 40-yr covenant, your next grant award would not step you down into a 20-yr covenant unless you have less than 20 years left on the 40-yr covenant.)

P. 29

Cash Match clarification – if you are providing anything less than a 25% or 50% cash match (non-profit/gov or Private owner respectively), you must ask for a waiver and provide justification.

P.31-32

Indirect costs – please provide a calculation for any grant administration or indirect costs requested in the budget. Up to 15% is allowed for indirect and grant admin, but an average range is 3-10%.

P.32

Hotel – the allowable cost for hotel stays required by a project is now at the charged rate.

P.33

Grant Administration – please provide a calculation for any grant administration or indirect costs requested in the budget. (i.e. hours expected for oversight of the grant X rate/hr.) Up to 15% is allowed for indirect and grant admin, but an average range is 3-10%.

P.34

Grant Contracts – SHF now administers either Awards or Agreements, depending on the size of the requested amount.

Awards (\$150,000 or less) can now be completed in less than a month, if the applicant is ready with all information required.

P. 39

Signature – signatures required for an application may be provided on multiple Signature Pages.

Signatures submitted with an application must be dated within 60 days of the application deadline.

Wet signatures are no longer required for financial reporting.

P.41

Waivers – a request must be made and a justification provided for any amount less than the required 25% for non-profit/governmental entities or the 50% for private/for-profit entities.

P.42

Grants \$1-\$35,000 – Award Announcement dates are now May 1 and November 1.

Drafts – Drafts received 30-60 before the deadline will receive 2 full reviews. Drafts received 15-29 days prior to the deadline will receive one full review. Drafts received 1-14 days prior to the deadline will receive a “red-flag” review only.

P.43

Signature Page – you may have multiple copies of the signature page for different entities if necessary. It must be signed and dated within 60 days of the grant deadline.

P.45

| Applicant Capacity – the point total for this section is 15.

If you are requesting a Maintenance Plan please describe that in the Project Description section rather than in Applicant Capacity.

P.47

Resource History, Significance and Description - now is its own section and is called Resource Significance. The required information is the same. The point total for this new section is 10.

Project History and Context – now is its own section and is called Project Context. The required information is the same. The point total for this section is 5.

P.48

Scope of Work and Budget – point total is now 15.

Architectural & Engineering Fees – if your project is primarily for planning and creation of Construction Documents, please use the individual lines to outline the costs for your project. If your project is primarily for physical work with architectural oversight, those costs should go into the box for Construction costs.

Grant Admin & Indirect – limited to 15% but on average should be within 3-10%.

P.49

Waiver Request – If **you** are not able to provide at least the minimum required cash match for your ownership type, you must request a waiver and provide a justification.

Project Description – Project Milestones are no longer included in the application.

P.51-52 – Project Milestone – this section has been replaced by a number of checkboxes requiring the attestation that the applicant understands the requirements of an HC-SHF award/agreement project schedule.

P.56

Signature Page – you may include a single attachment with multiple signatures pages from different entities, if necessary.

P.57

Resumes – please limit individual resumes/CVs to 5 pages or less.

P.58

Maps, Site Plans or Drawings – please resize these images to an 8.5X11 or 11x17

P.60

The Review process has changed significantly.

Three reviewers are assigned to each grant (one SHFAC member and two Outside Reviewers).

A staff member is assigned to each grant and creates a summary of the grant, as well as the three reviewers comments.

Staff has a two day meeting to review and discuss all summaries and add any additional staff comments, especially as they relate to previous experience with the applicant organization or previous phases of a project.

Staff then presents these summaries at the SHFAC meeting for the Council to discuss, recommend Funding or Non-Funding and vote. Their review is primarily for the technical aspects of the project proposed. Outlier scores will be assessed and if deemed unjustified, the Council vote on whether to remove the score from consideration. If removed, the score average will be re-assessed and the project will move to a new place in the score order.

Staff presents these summaries, along with discussion notes from SHFAC, to the AHPC if the grant is called-out, for them to discuss and review recommendations from SHFAC. Their review is primarily for geographical distribution and special initiatives of the board.

The recommendations from AHPC are forwarded to the History Colorado Board of Directors for their final decision.

P.63-65

The following is the updated Narrative Scoring Guidance for Reviewers –

Instructions

Score on a 100-point scale and note that it is extremely difficult for an application to score 100.

90-100% = Excellent

80-89% = Very good

70-79% = Fair/average

65-69% = Shows potential

0-64% = Insufficient

Applicant Capacity (Ability to successfully complete the project) 15 points

14-15 points (90%) = Excellent

12-13 points (80%) = Very good

11 points (70%) = Fair/average

10 points (65%) = Shows potential

0-9 points (0-64%) = Insufficient

- 1) Does the applicant's organization actively engage in historic preservation or is preservation or stewardship of a historic resource one of its goals?
- 2) Does the applicant have experience with similar projects, including self-funded and SHF-funded projects?
- 3) Do the members of the team have historic preservation experience or experience with SHF?
- 4) Does the applicant have future funding strategies in place to maintain the resource or to continue the program after the work in this application is completed?
- 5) If this is a repeat application, does the applicant explain how it addressed the previous reviewers' concerns?

Resource Significance (The importance of the resource and its historic integrity) 10 points

9-10 points (90%) = Excellent

8 points (80%) = Very good

7 points (70%) = Fair/average
6.5-7 points (65%) = Shows potential
0-6.4 points (0-64%) = Insufficient

- 1) Is the resource(s), or the resources this project will affect, historically significant or potentially significant at the local, state or national level? (The higher the significance, the higher the score.)
- 2) Based on the description provided, does the resource(s) have good historic integrity, or potential to regain its integrity? (Integrity is the resource's ability to convey its historic identity for which it is significant. The greater integrity or potential to regain it, the higher the score.)

Project Context (Understanding of the project's context and its relationship to historic preservation and archaeology) 5 points

5 points (90%) = Excellent
4 points (80%) = Very good
3.5 points (70%) = Fair/average
3.25 points (65%) = Shows potential
0-3.2 points (0-64%) = Insufficient

- 1) Does the application sufficiently explain the project's context (over approximately the last 10 years) and how they reached this phase of the overall project?
- 2) Does the application briefly outline the future phases (after this grant phase), if any? Note: this is different from future funding strategies discussed in Capacity.

Scope of Work & Budget (Clear list of tasks and reasonable costs) 15 points

14-15 points (90%) = Excellent
12-13 points (80%) = Very good
11 points (70%) = Fair/average
10 points (65%) = Shows potential
0-9 points (0-64%) = Insufficient

- 1) Does the Scope include all the relevant items to complete this project, including archaeological monitoring, if necessary? (If it includes irrelevant tasks, it should be noted and scored lower).
- 2) Are the tasks eligible for SHF funding? Read the list of Ineligible or Non-Competitive items on pages 35 and 36 of the Application Guide.
- 3) For archaeology projects, is tribal consultation or curation included, if necessary?
- 4) Are proposals or bids attached, and do they match the Scope of Work and Budget?
- 5) Are the costs reasonable to complete this project, including contingency?
- 6) If included, is Grant Administration reasonable and justified? (Up to 15% is allowed, but average range is 3% to 10%).
- 7) Is the cash match the minimum required? (25% of the Project Total, or 50% for private/for-profit owners).
- 8) If a cash match waiver is requested, is it justified?

Project Description (Understanding of preservation approaches and techniques) 20 points

18-20 points (90%) = Excellent
16-17 points (80%) = Very good
14-15 points (70%) = Fair/average
13 points (65%) = Shows potential
0-12 points (0-64%) = Insufficient

* Understand that many applicants are not archaeology and preservation professionals and may not be able to accurately describe the project in preservation and construction terms; therefore, you should score on the project's overall description rather than scrutinizing the details (the details either have been, or will be, scrutinized by SHF staff).

- 1) Will relevant deliverables be submitted that will demonstrate compliance with SHF policies?
- 2) Is the application clear on what the project will accomplish?
- 3) Without going into much detail, does the Description explain 1) why and 2) how the components of the project will be accomplished and 3) who is responsible for the work?
- 4) Does it meet the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeology and Historic Preservation? (The description does not need to provide great detail, such as exact materials and that is okay; however, if something is blatantly questionable, such as wholesale replacement of historic materials, then list those concerns.)
- 5) Does the Project Description correlate with the Scope of Work?
- 6) Are photos with captions attached and do they sufficiently 1) illustrate the condition of the resource(s), or 2) provide a representative sample of the resource(s) to be researched, or 3) illustrate potential outcomes of the project?
- 7) If there were previous materials completed for this project (historic structure assessment, survey forms, reports, etc.), are they attached and do they illustrate on-going success? [Note: if these previous materials were funded by SHF, know that SHF staff have reviewed them according to the Standards.]

Urgency (Need for immediate attention to tangible or intangible concerns) 15 points

14-15 points (90%) = Excellent
12-13 points (80%) = Very good
11 points (70%) = Fair/average
10 points (65%) = Shows potential
0-9 points (0-64%) = Insufficient

- 1) Are the physical conditions of the resource urgent (e.g., if the grant is not funded now will it quickly deteriorate or will further damage occur)?
- 2) Are there threats to the resource(s) or program?
- 3) Are there partnerships or cash match funds in jeopardy or dependent on this grant being awarded?
- 4) Will this project be completed if this grant is not awarded?
- 5) Is there a celebration or an event scheduled for which this project has to be completed now (within the next two years)?
- 6) Is this the final phase?
- 7) Are there other valid reasons for urgency?

Public Benefit, Project Promotion and State Plan (The public's benefit from, and support of, the project; project promotion and relationship to State Plan) 20 points

18-20 points (90%) = Excellent
16-17 points (80%) = Very good
14-15 points (70%) = Fair/average
13 points (65%) = Shows potential
0-12 points (0-64%) = Insufficient

- 1) Will the project provide a good public use or will the public be able to access the products developed with this project?
- 2) Does this project benefit minorities or under-represented communities and cultures?
- 3) Is the cash match for this project provided by the community or general public?
- 4) Does the project illustrate community support in ways other than monetary?

- 5) Will this project enhance public appreciation of historic preservation, economic development, and heritage tourism?
- 6) Are there good partnerships in place or will new partnerships be encouraged by this project?
- 7) Does the application include at least 5 recent letters of support from users and those from the community, and are they specific to this proposed project?
- 8) Does the application include promotion of the project and the SHF grant beyond the immediate community?
- 9) Does the application sufficiently argue how the project will directly support at least 2 goals in the Statewide Preservation Plan:
<https://www.historycolorado.org/sites/default/files/media/document/2017/StatePlanSummary.pdf>?