CITY OF BEND

City Hall
710 NW Wall Street
Bend, OR 97703

# MEMORANDUM

**To:** Environment and Climate Committee
**From:** Megan Lee, Environment and Climate Management Analyst
**Date:** October 8, 2026
**Re:** 2026 Small Business Assistance Grant Program Applications ECC Rankings

## Overview

This memo summarizes the results of the ECC application ranking exercise conducted to support discussion of the 2026 Small Business Assistance Grant Program applications. The results are intended to provide insight into areas of alignment and differing perspectives among participating reviewers and should not be interpreted as funding recommendations.

## Applicant Overview

- Total Amount Requested: 2,155,648.24
  - $443,941.00 for CCAP aligned projects
  - $1,711,734.24 for CoBEDSP aligned projects
- Number of Applications: 77
  - 14 CCAP aligned projects
  - 63 CoBEDSP aligned projects
- Amount of funding available: $130,000
  - $30,000 for CCAP aligned projects
  - $100,000 for CoBEDSP aligned projects

## Methodology and Limitations

ECC members were asked to independently score applications using the program scoring matrix and then rank applications based on their resulting scores. Applications were evaluated across the following criteria:

| Category | Description | Points |
|---|---|---|
| **Project Impact** | Assess the project's ability to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and the extent to which the project engages and benefits the local community. Impact | **42** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | will also take into account the cost effectiveness of the proposal and alignment with other City and community priorities. | |
| **Business Capacity & Readiness** | Consider the business' stability, readiness to implement the project (including resources to support project implementation), and past business performance. | **12** |
| **Feasibility** | Assesses the project's budget, timeline, implementation plan, and likelihood of successful project delivery. Consider realistic outcomes for these areas. | **12** |
| **Alignment with CCAP goals** | Assess how well the project supports and aligns with CCAP goals. | **12** |
| **Equity & Accessibility** | Assess how the project supports underserved businesses, improves economic access, or reduces structural barriers. | **22** |
| **TOTAL** | | **100** |

Reviewers were asked to rank applications from 1 (strongest) to 14 (weakest) based on their scoring results and overall assessment of the criteria above. A total of six ECC members submitted rankings. While this provides a broader range of perspectives than the initial analysis, the results should still be viewed as a discussion tool rather than a definitive representation of the full committee's priorities. Because not all ECC members participated, the rankings and consensus analysis may not fully reflect the perspectives of the committee as a whole. Average rankings were calculated to identify overall preferences among participating reviewers. Standard deviation (SD) was calculated to assess the degree of agreement among reviewers. Lower SD values indicate stronger consensus, while higher SD values indicate greater variation in reviewer perspectives.

# Average Ranking Results

**The following applications received the strongest overall rankings:**

1. High & Tight Jobsites (Average Rank: 1.67)
2. Scrap Broker (Average Rank: 4.33)
3. Float Again (Average Rank: 4.83)
4. Rugged Thread (Average Rank: 5.00)
5. Oregon Adventure Trucks (Average Rank: 5.17)
6. CLG Outdoor Lighting (Average Rank: 5.17)

**Mid-ranked applications included:**

- Undertow Towing & Roadside Assistance (6.83)
- OnTo Technology (8.00)
- ICR Engineering (9.00)

**Applications receiving the lowest average rankings were:**

- Axiology (10.67)
- LUNO (10.67)
- School of Enrichment (10.67)
- Shakti Farm Design (11.33)
- Bend Plastic Supply (11.67)

# Consensus Analysis

## Strong Consensus

The following application demonstrated strong agreement among participating reviewers:

- High & Tight Jobsites (SD: 1.21)

### Moderate Consensus

The following applications demonstrated moderate agreement among reviewers:

- Float Again
- Rugged Thread
- Oregon Adventure Trucks
- CLG Outdoor Lighting
- LUNO
- School of Enrichment
- Shakti Farm Design
- Bend Plastic Supply

### Mixed Perspectives

The following applications received a wider range of rankings and may warrant additional discussion during committee deliberations:

- Scrap Broker
- Undertow Towing & Roadside Assistance
- OnTo Technology
- ICR Engineering
- Axiology

Notably, ICR Engineering, Axiology, and Undertow Towing & Roadside Assistance exhibited the greatest variation in reviewer rankings, indicating substantially different assessments among participating reviewers.

| Rank | Application | Avg. Rank | SD |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | High & Tight Jobsites | **1.67** | 1.21 |
| 2 | Scrap Broker | **4.33** | 3.14 |
| 3 | Float Again | **4.83** | 2.93 |
| 4 | Rugged Thread | **5.00** | 2.10 |
| 5 (tie) | Oregon Adventure Trucks | **5.17** | 2.93 |
| 5 (tie) | CLG Outdoor Lighting | **5.17** | 2.14 |
| 7 | Undertow Towing & Roadside Assistance | **6.83** | 3.37 |
| 8 | OnTo Technology | **8.00** | 3.16 |
| 9 | ICR Engineering | **9.00** | 4.00 |
| 10 (tie) | Axiology | **10.67** | 3.78 |
| 10 (tie) | LUNO | **10.67** | 2.73 |
| 10 (tie) | School of Enrichment | **10.67** | 2.25 |
| 13 | Shakti Farm Design | **11.33** | 2.07 |
| 14 | Bend Plastic Supply | **11.67** | 2.66 |

## Key Takeaways

- High & Tight Jobsites emerged as the clear top-ranked application and was also the only application to achieve strong reviewer consensus.
- Several highly ranked applications, including Scrap Broker, Float Again, Rugged Thread, Oregon Adventure Trucks, and CLG Outdoor Lighting, performed well overall but showed varying levels of agreement among reviewers.
- While Scrap Broker ranked second overall, reviewer rankings varied considerably, suggesting differing assessments of the project's relative merits.
- ICR Engineering and Axiology generated the greatest variation in rankings, indicating that reviewers weighed application strengths and weaknesses differently.
- The range of rankings across several applications highlights the differing ways reviewers evaluated project impact, equity and accessibility, feasibility, business readiness, and alignment with CCAP goals.

## Conclusion

The ranking exercise provides a useful snapshot of how participating ECC members evaluated applications using the established scoring framework. The results identify several applications that were consistently viewed favorably, particularly High & Tight Jobsites, while also highlighting applications that generated a broader range of perspectives among reviewers. Given that six, but not all, ECC members participated in the exercise, these findings should be considered one input among several during committee deliberations. The rankings and consensus analysis can help identify areas of alignment as well as applications that may benefit from additional discussion before final funding recommendations are made.

## Questions For ECC

- Do we agree with the rankings?
- Which applications do we want to fund?
- At how much do we want to fund these projects?

## Next Steps

- Staff will finalize recommendations and submit them to the City Manager.
- Final award announcements will be made later this year.