North Richmond
Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee
Joint Expenditure Planning
Subcommittee Meeting

Monday, May 7, 2012
11:00 am – 1:00 pm

Richmond Conference Room | 450 Civic Center Plaza | Richmond, CA 94801

* NOTE MEETING LOCATION *

Subcommittee Members:
Gayle McLaughlin, Member - Richmond Mayor & Councilmember
John Gioia, Member - Contra Costa County Supervisor
Joe Wallace, Member - NRMAC Representative: Unincorporated Area

Meeting Agenda:
1. Welcome and Introductions
2. Public Comment on any item not on the agenda (not to exceed 2 minutes)
3. DISCUSS and FORWARD recommendations to the North Richmond Joint Expenditure Planning Committee regarding proposals received in response to the 2012/13 Funding Request Proposal and Application released April 4, 2012.
4. ADJOURN to next meeting.

Agendas, meeting notes and other information regarding this committee can be found online at:
www.cccounty.us/nr

Meeting materials will be made available for public inspection, during business hours at 450 Civic Center Plaza in Richmond, within 96 hours of meeting date and time.

The North Richmond Waste & Recovery Mitigation Fee Joint Expenditure Planning Subcommittee will provide reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities planning to attend the Subcommittee’s meeting. Please call or e-mail the following Subcommittee staff person at least 72 hours before the meeting:
Lori Reese-Brown - City of Richmond, (510) 620-6869, lori_reese-brown@ci.richmond.ca.us
**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:** Staff recommends that the Subcommittee select no more than four (4) of the 12 proposed Community Based Projects for potential funding and identify recommended funding award level as a percentage of total funding that may ultimately be added to Strategy 14 in the Amended 2012/13 Expenditure Plan.

Staff will be presenting recommendations regarding an Amended 2012/2013 Expenditure Plan, including revised budgetary allocations for all Strategies to the Committee at their meeting scheduled for June 1st. Unfortunately, the amount of funding anticipated to be available for allocation as a whole to fund activities beyond June 30, 2012 is substantially less than would be needed to fund any Community Based Projects while maintaining funding for all other existing Strategies. Additionally, there are some related matters that will be presented/considered by the Committee which Staff anticipates will also impact the amount of funding potentially available for allocation for existing Strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant Organization / Fiscal Sponsor</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Number of Submittal Requirements/ Criteria Not Met (0=Complete/ Eligible)</th>
<th>Scores based on official Evaluation Criteria specified in the Funding Request Guidelines</th>
<th>If funding awarded, recommended percent of total amount that is allocated for Community Based Projects (Strategy 14)</th>
<th>ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS BASED UPON THE SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS SPECIFIED IN THE FUNDING REQUEST GUIDELINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athletes United for Peace</td>
<td>Community Media Outreach Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING - Completed Proposal &amp; Application including required supporting documentation was all submitted on time and in the manner required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body-coding A-Z Inc. / CHDC</td>
<td>Green TEAMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing Electronic Copy of Application/Proposal in Word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Center for Human Development (CHD)</td>
<td>Neighborhood Enhancement Team (NET)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING - Completed Proposal &amp; Application including required supporting documentation was all submitted on time and in the manner required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities United Resorting Mother Earth (CURME) / GRIP</td>
<td>Lots of Crops</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing Fiscal Sponsor's Proof of 501(c)(3), however Staff received proof of this same Fiscal Sponsor's 501(c)(3) documentation in other Funding Request Submittals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Team</td>
<td>Aqua Team Watershed Stewardship Program</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing (1) Letter from Prior Funder and (2) Authorization Letter(s) from Property Owner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healing Circles of Hope (dba MASK) / GRIP</td>
<td>Community Wellness and Healing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing (1) Applicant Signature on Acknowledgement, (2) Fiscal Sponsor Signature on Acknowledgement, (3) Fiscal Sponsor Proof of 501(c)(3) status, (4) Fiscal Sponsor Agreement and (5) Authorization Letter(s) from Property Owner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant Organization / Fiscal Sponsor</td>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Number of Submittal Requirements/ Criteria Not Met (0=Complete/Eligible)</td>
<td>County Staff</td>
<td>City Staff</td>
<td>If funding awarded, recommended percent of total amount that is allocated for Community Based Projects (Strategy 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGlothen Temple Educational Community Center</td>
<td>McGlothen Temple Educational Community Center</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing (1) Electronic Copy of Application/Proposal in Word, (2) Proof of 501(c)(3) status and (3) Letter from Prior Funder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach Fellowship International + Men &amp; Women of Valor</td>
<td>Reach for Jobs Block Clean-up Crew</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing (1) Electronic Copy of Application/Proposal in Word, (2) Pages identifying proposed project location or service area &amp; amount or proposed Administrative Costs, (3) Incomplete Project Schedule and (4) Authorization Letter(s) from Property Owner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robinson-Weeks-Robinson Scholarship Fund, Inc.</td>
<td>Education Mitigation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing Letter from Prior Funder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Progress / GRIP</td>
<td>Building Relationships within the Community</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing (1) Electronic Copy of Application/Proposal in Word, (2) Fiscal Sponsor Proof of 501(c)(3) status, (3) Incomplete Project Schedule and (4) Authorization Letter(s) from Property Owner(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ujima Lodge #35 F. &amp; A. M. -- 'Beehive Corps' / GRIP</td>
<td>BRIGHTIN' IT UP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>ELIGIBLE TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING - Completed Proposal &amp; Application including required supporting documentation was all submitted on time and in the manner required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unity Within The Communities / GRIP</td>
<td>Communities Health Readiness for Change</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing (1) Electronic Copy of Application/Proposal in Word and (2) Authorization Letter(s) from Property Owner(s)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Applicant: Athletes United for Peace  
Project Name: Community Media Outreach Project
Reviewer: Demian Hardman/County  
Date: 5/1/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)
Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

Impact (10 points max)
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

Financially Sound (20 points max)
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)

Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:
0 = inadequate 1 = weak 2 = average 3 = strong 4 = strong 5= ideal

Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5:
0 = inadequate 1 = very weak 2 = weak 3 = average 4 = strong 5= ideal

Total Score: 60
Funding Priorities

Provide a score between 1-3 for each “Funding Priority” YES answer, but only if accompanied with narrative response substantiating the YES (e.g. how).  
1 = weak 2 = average 3 = strong

i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents  3
ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities  1
iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s) 0
iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)  2
v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget  3
vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping  2
vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 0

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts)  11

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed (extra 5 points for this Category) -
Project Idea(s):__________________________________  0      1      2      3      4      5 0

GRAND TOTAL  71

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?
Applicant has proven track record of providing appropriate reporting information on deliverables and invoicing requirements related to the Mitigation funding requirements. Project proposal provides youth and young adults the opportunity to get experience working on media related efforts that could potentially provide the appropriate training for future job growth opportunities. Students/Interns also have chance to learn about the historical context specific to the issues that face North Richmond Richmond regarding blight.

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?
No concerns. Have worked with the applicant in the past.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
While the proposal provides strong training for youth and young adults, deliverables on how project is specifically related to reducing illegal dumping are difficult to quantify.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Recommend that some funding be provided, as job training portion of proposal is strong. However, direct outcomes related to reducing current illegal dumping consistent with the purpose of the Mitigation funding efforts as a result of the project may be hard to quantify.
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Body-coding A-Z Inc. Project Name: Green Teaching Environmental Activities Matter on Saturdays, Green (TEAMS)

Reviewer: Demian Hardman/County Date: 5/2/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

Impact (10 points max)
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

Financially Sound (20 points max)
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)

MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

Funding Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts) | 4

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed (extra 5 points for this Category) -
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GRAND TOTAL

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?

Project proposed in the North Richmond area.

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

Not aware of any concerns regarding this Applicant.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

Project not consistent with Mitigation Fee requirements. Proposal does not clearly specify how illegal dumping will be addressed.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Not recommended for funding, unless scope of work is substantially modified to include tasks that directly relate to the issue of reducing the cost associated with illegal dumping consistent with the purpose of the Mitigation Fee; including the incorporation of well defined measurable deliverables that provide quantifiable benefits to the North Richmond Mitigation Fee area.
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: CHD  Project Name: Neighborhood Enhancement Team (NET): Bridging the Intergenerational Gap
Reviewer: Deidra Dingman  Date: 5/3/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate 1 = weak 2 = average 3 = strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate 1 = very weak 2 = weak 3 = average 4 = strong 5= ideal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)
Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

Impact (10 points max)
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

Financially Sound (20 points max)
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)
### Funding Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities** *(add above amounts)*  
**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**

**New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed** *(extra 5 points for this Category)*  
Project Idea(s): ____________________________________________ 0 1 2 3 4 5 0

**GRAND TOTAL**  
**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**
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**What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?**  
_____

**Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?**  
_____

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**  
_____

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:** _____

- Page 2 of 2 -

G:\Conservation\Deidra\Illegal Dumping\BMPC Mitigation Fee Committee\2012-2013 Exp Plan\Community Based Projects\Evaluation Forms\County Evaluation Scores\Evaluations by Deidra\Evaluation_CHD.doc
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Center for Human Development (CHD)  
Project Name: Neighborhood Enhancement Team (NET)  
Bridging the Intergenerational Gap

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown  
Date: 5/2/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

**Evaluation Criteria** (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Capacity (9 points max)**

| Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist | 3 |
| Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i | 3 |
| Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l | 3 |

**Project Description & Concept (30 points max)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee | 4 |
| Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d | 4 |
| Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d | 5 |
| Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d | 4 |
| Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a | 4 |
| Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d | 4 |

**Impact (10 points max)**

| Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b | 4 |
| Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c | 5 |

**Outcomes (10 points max)**

| Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h | 4 |
| Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f | 4 |

**Financially Sound (20 points max)**

| Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d | 3 |
| Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d | 3 |
| Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d | 3 |
| Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j | 5 |

**SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)**

MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)  
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### Funding Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities** *(add above amounts)*  
**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed *(extra 5 points for this Category)*  
Project Idea(s):__________________________________

**GRAND TOTAL**  
**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:**
Applicant: CURME  
Project Name: Lots of Crops

Reviewer: Deidra Dingman  
Date: 5/3/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Capacity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) – see Letter from Past Funder(s) - OR - NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist. Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i. Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description &amp; Concept</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee. Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d. Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d. Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d. Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a. Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b. Project is located within NRMF Funding Area - OR - program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h. Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially Sound</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d. Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d. Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d. Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)**

Maximum Base Score = 79 Points (not including optional funding priority score on the next page)
## Funding Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities** *(add above amounts)*  
15

**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**

**New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed (extra 5 points for this Category) -**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Idea(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**

**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**

88

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?

_____

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

_____

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**

_____

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:**

_____

- Page 2 of 2 -
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Iyalode Kinney        Project Name: Communities United Restoring Mother Earth (CURME)
Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown      Date: 5/2/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Capacity (9 points max)**
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) – see Letter from
- Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist 3
- Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i 3
- Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l 3

**Project Description & Concept (30 points max)**
Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee 4
- Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d 4
- Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d 4
- Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d 4
- Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a 4
- Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d 5

**Impact (10 points max)**
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b 3
- Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c 5

**Outcomes (10 points max)**
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h 4
- Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f 4

**Financially Sound (20 points max)**
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d 3
- Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d 2
- Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d 3
- Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j 4

**SUBTOTAL – Base Score** (add above amounts)
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)

62
## Funding Priorities

| i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents | 3 |
| ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities | 3 |
| iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s) | 1 |
| iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s) | 3 |
| v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget | 3 |
| vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping | 2 |
| vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts | 2 |

### SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts)  
**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed (*extra 5 points for this Category*):

**Project Idea(s):**

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |

### GRAND TOTAL

**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

___

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:  

___
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Earth Team  Project Name: Aqua Team Watershed Stewardship Program
Reviewer: Demian Hardman/County  Date: 5/2/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5: |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 0 = inadequate | 1 = very weak | 2 = weak | 3 = average | 4 = strong | 5= ideal |

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)
Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

Impact (10 points max)
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic – Section b
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

Financially Sound (20 points max)
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)
### Funding Priorities

Provide a score between 1-3 for each “Funding Priority” YES answer, but only if accompanied with narrative response substantiating the YES (e.g. how).  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities** *(add above amounts)*  

**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**  

13

**New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed** *(extra 5 points for this Category)*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**  

**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**  

67

### What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?

- Clearly defined tasks, and strong evidence of meeting financial reporting requirements. Project clearly defines how it is in alignment with other existing Mitigation funded strategies. Budget seems very reasonable based on tasks described.

### Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

- Not aware of any concerns regarding Applicant.

### COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

- Many proposals in the past have proposed community cleaning/restoration projects. Quantifiable positive outcomes that actually reduce illegal dumping and blight resulting from the proposed project are often very difficult to assess specific to long term benefits.

### FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:

Proposal seems very similar to other projects that have been funded in the past. Nothing new and different regarding the proposal in general. Could recommend funding, if deemed appropriate.
# Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

**Applicant:** Healing Circles of Hope (dba) MASK  
**Project Name:** Community Wellness and Healing

**Reviewer:** Lori Reese-Brown  
**Date:** 5/2/2012

**Directions:**
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

## Evaluation Criteria

### Organizational Capacity (9 points max)
- Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
- Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
- Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l

### Project Description & Concept (30 points max)
- Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
- Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
- Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
- Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
- Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
- Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

### Impact (10 points max)
- Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
- Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

### Outcomes (10 points max)
- Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
- Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

### Financially Sound (20 points max)
- Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
- Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
- Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
- Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

**SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)**

56

**MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)**
### Funding Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities** *(add above amounts)*

**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed *(extra 5 points for this Category)*

- Project Idea(s): ______________________________________

*GRAND TOTAL*  

**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:**

-  

-  

- Page 2 of 2 -
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Healing Circles  Project Name: Community Wellness & Healing Project in NR
Reviewer: Deidra Dingman  Date: 5/3/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate  1 = weak  2 = average  3 = strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Capacity (9 points max)**
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) – see Letter from Past Funder(s) - OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate  1 = very weak  2 = weak  3 = average  4 = strong  5 = ideal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description & Concept (30 points max)**
Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

**Impact (10 points max)**
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area - OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

**Outcomes (10 points max)**
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

**Financially Sound (20 points max)**
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

**SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)**
48

**MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)**
### Funding Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts)**: 7

**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed *(extra 5 points for this Category)* -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Idea(s):</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**

**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**

55

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?

_____

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

_____

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S): 

_____

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: _____
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: McGlothen Temple Educational Community Center  Project Name: McGlothen Temple Edu. Center
Reviewer: Demian Hardman/County  Date: 5/1/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system: |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 0 = inadequate  | 1 = weak         | 2 = average      | 3 = strong       |

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)

| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5: |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 0 = inadequate  | 1 = very weak    | 2 = weak         | 3 = average      | 4 = strong       |

Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

Impact (10 points max)
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

Financially Sound (20 points max)
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)  35
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)
## Funding Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities**  
(add above amounts)  
6

**Maximum Funding Priority Score = 21 Points**

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed *(extra 5 points for this Category)* -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**  

Maximum Score = 100 Points

41

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?

Project schedule seems reasonable.

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

Not aware of any concerns/issues about this Applicant.

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**

Proposal in general does not provide sufficient information on how they are going to accomplish their project goals in connection with proposed budget, which seems very large (Total of $114,596.00 proposed to be used). Measurable outcomes very hard to quantify based on proposal language.

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:** Not recommended for funding. Project did not have letter from past funder submitted with application.
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Men & Women of Valor/Reach Fellowship International
Project Name: Reach for Jobs Block Clean-up Crew
Reviewer: Deidra Dingman
Date: 5/3/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system: |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 0 = inadequate  | 1 = weak         | 2 = average      | 3 = strong       |

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l

| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5: |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 0 = inadequate  | 1 = very weak    | 2 = weak         | 3 = average      | 4 = strong       |

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)
Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

Impact (10 points max)
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

Financially Sound (20 points max)
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE) 36
**Funding Priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide a score between 1-3 for each “Funding Priority” YES answer, but only if accompanied with narrative response substantiating the YES (e.g. how).</th>
<th>1 = weak</th>
<th>2 = average</th>
<th>3 = strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts)** 9

**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**

**New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed (extra 5 points for this Category)**

| Project Idea(s): | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |

**GRAND TOTAL**

**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**

45

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?

_____ 

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

_____ 

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

_____ 

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: _____
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Reach Fellowship International and Men & Women of Valor
Project Name: Reach for Jobs Block Clean-up Crew

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown Date: 5/2/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:</th>
<th>0 = inadequate</th>
<th>1 = weak</th>
<th>2 = average</th>
<th>3 = strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist 3
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i 3
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l 3

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)

| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5: | 0 = inadequate | 1 = very weak | 2 = weak | 3 = average | 4 = strong | 5= ideal |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee 4
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d 4
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d 5
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d 4
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a 4
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d 4

Impact (10 points max)
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b 5
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c 5

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h 5
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f 5

Financially Sound (20 points max)
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d 4
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d 3
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d 4
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j 5

SUBTOTAL – Base Score 70
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)
**Funding Priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities** *(add above amounts)*

21 POINTS

**New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed** *(extra 5 points for this Category)*

Project Idea(s): ________________________________

0 1 2 3 4 5 0

**GRAND TOTAL**

91 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:**

- Page 2 of 2 -
**Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation**

Applicant: Robinson-Weeks-Robinson Scholarship Fund, Inc.  
Project Name: Education Mitigation

Reviewer: Demian Hardman/County  
Date: 5/2/2012

**Directions:**
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

**Evaluation Criteria** *(applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Organizational Capacity (9 points max)**

Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist  
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i  
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l

**Project Description & Concept (30 points max)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 = inadequate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
- Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
- Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
- Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
- Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
- Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

**Impact (10 points max)**

Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

**Outcomes (10 points max)**

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

**Financially Sound (20 points max)**

Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

**SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)**

MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Page 1 of 2 -
Funding Priorities

Provide a score between 1-3 for each “Funding Priority” YES answer, but only if accompanied with narrative response substantiating the YES (e.g. how).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = weak</th>
<th>2 = average</th>
<th>3 = strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts)**

6

**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed (*extra 5 points for this Category*) -

Project Idea(s): ___________________________ 0 1 2 3 4 5 2

**GRAND TOTAL**

60

**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?

Different approach (New project idea) to target specific areas into zones, and reasonable understanding of the areas being targeted to address illegal dumping and blight.

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

Am not aware of any concerns/issues related to this Applicant.

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**

The proposal does not clearly define the deliverables to provide enough information on how outcomes can be measured to support the work proposed to be completed. Community outreach efforts identified are redundant to existing mitigation strategies. Proposal does not show that it will collaborate with existing mitigation strategies.

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:** Project scope needs to be better defined to ensure no redundancy occurs with existing mitigation strategies. Project idea to target specific zones is a nice new idea. Proposal needs to better job of identifying how it is going to accomplish its proposed tasks. Could recommend funding if changes to scope of work are done and proposal deliverables are clearly outlined for success.
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Social Progress/GRIP  Project Name: Building Relationships within the Community
Reviewer: Deidra Dingman  Date: 5/3/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system: |
|----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| 0 = inadequate                   | 1 = weak | 2 = average | 3 = strong |

**Organizational Capacity (9 points max)**
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) – see Letter from
- Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist 1
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l

**Project Description & Concept (30 points max)**
Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee 3
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d 2
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d 3
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d 2
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a 3
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d 0

**Impact (10 points max)**
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b 2
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c 4

**Outcomes (10 points max)**
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h 3
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f 2

**Financially Sound (20 points max)**
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d 4
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d 3
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d 3
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j 3

**SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)**
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)
43
Funding Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts)**  
*MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS*

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed *(extra 5 points for this Category)*  
Project Idea(s): ________________________________  0 1 2 3 4 5

**GRAND TOTAL**  
*MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS*

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:** ___
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: **Eleanor Thompson**  Project Name: Greater Richmond Inter-Faith Program

Reviewer: **Lori Reese-Brown**  Date: 5/2/2012

**Directions:**
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Proposals, Applications and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

**Evaluation Criteria** *(applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)*

### Organizational Capacity (9 points max)
- Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
  - See Letter from Past Funder(s) or NRMF Staff Summary

- Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
  - See Section i

- Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l
  - See Section l

### Project Description & Concept (30 points max)
- Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
  - See Section a

- Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
  - See Section d

- Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
  - See Section d

- Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
  - See Section d

- Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
  - See Section d

- Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d
  - See Section d

### Impact (10 points max)
- Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
  - See Section b

- Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c
  - See Section c

### Outcomes (10 points max)
- Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
  - See Section h

- Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f
  - See Section f

### Financially Sound (20 points max)
- Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
  - See Section d

- Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
  - See Section d

- Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
  - See Section d

- Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j
  - See Section j

**SUBTOTAL – Base Score** *(add above amounts)*
- **63**

**MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)**
### North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

**Funding Priorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts)**  
**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed (extra 5 points for this Category)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Idea(s):Proposal identified specific zones</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**  
**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:**
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Ujima Lodge #35 F. & A. M. – ‘Beehive Corps’  Project Name: ‘BRIGHTIN’ IT UP

Reviewer: Demian Hardman/County  Date: 5/1/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:</th>
<th>0 = inadequate</th>
<th>1 = weak</th>
<th>2 = average</th>
<th>3 = strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)
Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

Impact (10 points max)
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

Financially Sound (20 points max)
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts) 46
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)
**Funding Priorities**

Provide a score between 1-3 for each “Funding Priority” YES answer, but only if accompanied with narrative response substantiating the YES (e.g. how).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = weak</th>
<th>2 = average</th>
<th>3 = strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii.</td>
<td>Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii.</td>
<td>Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv.</td>
<td>Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v.</td>
<td>Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi.</td>
<td>Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii.</td>
<td>Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts)**

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

12

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed (*extra 5 points for this Category* -
Project Idea(s):__________________________________ 0 1 2 3 4 5 0

**GRAND TOTAL**

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

58

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?

Fiscal Responsibility and Accounting practices seem very good in general. Applicant submitted complete application materials.

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?

Not aware of any concerns about this Applicant

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**

Proposed project includes installation of CFL’s and Carbon Monoxide Detectors, which does not directly relate to the reduction of blight. Deliverables to show that the cost to install CFLs and Carbon Monoxide Detectors will reduce blight seems very arbitrary and difficult to show how it would reduce blight related to the purpose of the Mitigation Fee.

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:** Recommend that this project could be funded if it excludes the installation of CFLs and Carbon Monoxide Detectors and provides more detail on other ways it will directly reduce blight in the Community.

**NOTE:** The County already has a Weatherization Program funded under the Federal Department of Energy that assists low-income families related to making homes energy efficient, such as installation of energy efficient items in homes, like Carbon Monoxide Detectors.
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Unity Within TheCommunities  
Project Name: Communities Health Readiness for Change

Reviewer: Demian Hardman/County  
Date: 5/2/2012

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
2. ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST PRIOR TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system: |
| 0 = inadequate | 1 = weak | 2 = average | 3 = strong |

**Organizational Capacity (9 points max)**
Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Capacity</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence in good standing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualified staff</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous services in North Richmond</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Description & Concept (30 points max)**

| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5: |
| 0 = inadequate | 1 = very weak | 2 = weak | 3 = average | 4 = strong | 5= ideal |

Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description &amp; Concept</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem(s) identified in Section a</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks clearly identify actions</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks adequately described</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of staff/interns identified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks expected to address/impact Problem(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project schedule specifies start/end dates</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact (10 points max)**
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Problem(s) addressed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project location</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcomes (10 points max)**
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes clear and measurable</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability plans</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Financially Sound (20 points max)**
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies) – Section d
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financially Sound</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per task identified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost effective budget</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget per task realistic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal/contract management experience</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)**

MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)

42

G:\Conservation\Deidra\Illegal Dumping\BMPC Mitigation Fee Committée\2012-2013 Exp Plan\Community Based Projects\Evaluation Forms\County Evaluation Scores\Evaluations Completed by Demian\Evaluation Score_County_Unity Within TheCommunities.doc
Funding Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provide a score between 1-3 for each “Funding Priority” YES answer, but only if accompanied with narrative response substantiating the YES (e.g. how).</th>
<th>1 = weak</th>
<th>2 = average</th>
<th>3 = strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts) 9

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed (extra 5 points for this Category) -

Project Idea(s):__________________________________ 0 1 2 3 4 5 0

GRAND TOTAL

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS 51

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?
Project task budget table is generally easy to understand.

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?
Am not aware of any concerns about this applicant.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
Project does not meet the intent and purpose of Mitigation Funding. Proposal not directly related to addressing how to reduce issues specific to illegal dumping.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Not recommended for funding unless substantial modifications to the proposal is made, such as changes to tasks that would specifically relate to reducing the issue of illegal dumping in the North Richmond area.