

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

NORTH RICHMOND MITIGATION FEE
2012/2013 Community Based Project Funding Requests

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.

Applicant Organization / Fiscal Sponsor	Project Title	Number of Submittal Requirements/ Criteria Not Met (0=Complete/Eligible)	Scores based on official Evaluation Criteria specified in the Funding Request Guidelines		If funding awarded, recommended percent of total amount that is allocated for Community Based Projects (Strategy 14)	ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS BASED UPON THE SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS SPECIFIED IN THE FUNDING REQUEST GUIDELINES
			County Staff	City Staff		
Athletes United for Peace	Community Media Outreach Project	0	71	n/a		ELIGIBLE TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING - Completed Proposal & Application including required supporting documentation was all submitted on time and in the manner required.
Body-coding A-Z Inc. / CHDC	Green TEAMS	1	44	n/a		SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing Electronic Copy of Application/Proposal in Word
Center for Human Development (CHD)	Neighborhood Enhancement Team (NET)	0	64	83		ELIGIBLE TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING - Completed Proposal & Application including required supporting documentation was all submitted on time and in the manner required.
Communities United Resorting Mother Earth (CURME) / GRIP	Lots of Crops	1	88	79		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.
Earth Team	Aqua Team Watershed Stewardship Program	2	67	n/a		SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing (1) Letter from Prior Funder and (2) Authorization Letter(s) from Property Owner(s)
Healing Circles of Hope (dba MASK) / GRIP	Community Wellness and Healing	5	55	72		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)

NORTH RICHMOND MITIGATION FEE
2012/2013 Community Based Project Funding Requests

Applicant Organization / Fiscal Sponsor	Project Title	Number of Submittal Requirements/ Criteria Not Met (0=Complete/ Eligible)	Scores based on official Evaluation Criteria specified in the Funding Request Guidelines		If funding awarded, recommended percent of total amount that is allocated for Community Based Projects (Strategy 14)	ELIGIBILITY DETERMINATIONS BASED UPON THE SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS SPECIFIED IN THE FUNDING REQUEST GUIDELINES
			County Staff	City Staff		
McGlothen Temple Educational Community Center	McGlothen Temple Educational Community Center	3	41	n/a		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
Reach Fellowship International + Men & Women of Valor	Reach for Jobs Block Clean-up Crew	4	45	91		SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing (1) Electronic Copy of Application/Proposal in Word, (2) Pages identifying proposed project location or service area & amount or proposed Administrative Costs, (3) Incomplete Project Schedule and (4) Authorization Letter(s) from Property Owner(s)
Robinshon-Weeks-Robinson Scholarship Fund, Inc.	Education Mitigation	1	60	n/a		SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing Letter from Prior Funder
Social Progress / GRIP	Building Relationships within the Community	4	53	84		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)
Ujima Lodge #35 F. & A. M. -- 'Beehive Corps' / GRIP	BRIGHTIN' IT UP	0	58	n/a		ELIGIBLE TO BE CONSIDERED FOR FUNDING - Completed Proposal & Application including required supporting documentation was all submitted on time and in the manner required.
Unity Within The Communities / GRIP	Communities Health Readiness for Change	2	51	n/a		SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS NOT MET - Missing (1) Electronic Copy of Application/Proposal in Word and (2) Authorization Letter(s) from Property Owner(s)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Athletes United for Peace Project Name: Community Media Outreach Project

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

Directions:

- 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.
- 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 2

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 3

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 3

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 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 4

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 3

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 4

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 4

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 60

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

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 *(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	<u>1</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>2</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>2</u>

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	<u>2</u>
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d	<u>2</u>
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d	<u>3</u>
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d	<u>2</u>
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a	<u>2</u>
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d	<u>3</u>

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>2</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>2</u>

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	<u>3</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>2</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>2</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>4</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 40

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

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 1
- ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities 0
- 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) 1
- v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget 0
- vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping 0
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 2

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)* -
 Project Idea(s): _____ **0 1 2 3 4 5 0**

GRAND TOTAL 44
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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:

- 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.
- 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	<u>2</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>3</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>3</u>

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

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)

Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee	<u>2</u>
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d	<u>4</u>
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d	<u>3</u>
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d	<u>4</u>
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a	<u>4</u>
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d	<u>4</u>

Impact (10 points max)

Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b	<u>3</u>
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c	<u>4</u>

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>3</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>2</u>

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	<u>4</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>2</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>2</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>3</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 52

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

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 2
- 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 2
- vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping 1
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 2

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (*add above amounts*) 12
 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 64
 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: Center for Human Development (CHD)
Bridging the Intergenerational Gap

Project Name: Neighborhood Enhancement Team (NET)

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

Directions:

- 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.
- 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	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	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)* 65

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

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 | 3 |
| iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s) | 2 |
| 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)* 18
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 83
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: 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 *(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	<u>3</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>3</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>3</u>

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

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>5</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>5</u>

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	<u>4</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>3</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>4</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>5</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 73

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

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 3
- 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) 3
- v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget 3
- vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping 3
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 0

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*) -

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

GRAND TOTAL 88
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: Iyalode Kinney Project Name: Communities United Restoring Mother Earth (CURME)

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

Directions:

- 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.
- 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	<u>3</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>3</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>3</u>

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

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

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	<u>3</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>2</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>3</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>4</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 62

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

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 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*) 17
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 79
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 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	<u>1</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>3</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>3</u>

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	<u>3</u>
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d	<u>4</u>
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d	<u>4</u>
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d	<u>4</u>
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a	<u>4</u>
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d	<u>4</u>

Impact (10 points max)

Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b	<u>3</u>
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c	<u>4</u>

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>3</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>4</u>

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	<u>5</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>4</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>4</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>5</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 54

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

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 2
- 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) 2
- 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 2
- 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*) 13
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 67
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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:

- 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.
- 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	<u>3</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>2</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>3</u>

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	<u>2</u>
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d	<u>3</u>
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d	<u>3</u>
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d	<u>4</u>
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a	<u>3</u>
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d	<u>4</u>

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>3</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>3</u>

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	<u>4</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>3</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>3</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>5</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 56

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

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 2
- 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) 2
- v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget 2
- 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*) 14
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 72
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: 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)*

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 2
 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

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

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)

Problem(s) identified in Section a is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee 1
 Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d 4
 Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d 2
 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 3
 Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d 2

Impact (10 points max)

Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b 1
 Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c 3

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 3

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 4

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

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

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 0
- 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) 0
- v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget 2
- vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping 1
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 1

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*) -
 Project Idea(s): _____ **0 1 2 3 4 5 0**

GRAND TOTAL 55
 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: McGlothen Temple Educational Community Center Project Name: McGlothen Temple Edu. Center

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

Directions:

- 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.
- 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	<u>0</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>2</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>2</u>

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	<u>3</u>
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d	<u>1</u>
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d	<u>1</u>
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d	<u>3</u>
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a	<u>3</u>
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d	<u>4</u>

Impact (10 points max)

Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b	<u>2</u>
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c	<u>3</u>

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>2</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>2</u>

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	<u>2</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>1</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>2</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>2</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 35

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

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 2
- ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities 0
- 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) 1
- v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget 1
- 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*) 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 0**

GRAND TOTAL 41
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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:

- 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.
- 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 1

Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l 3

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

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)

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 2

Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d 2

Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d 3

Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a 2

Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d 2

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 1

Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f 1

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 2

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 2

Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j 2

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 36

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

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 0
- iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s) 3
- iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s) 1
- v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget 0
- vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping 1
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 1

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 45
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: 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 *(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	<u>3</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>3</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>3</u>

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>5</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>5</u>

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	<u>4</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>3</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>4</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>5</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 70

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

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 3
- iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s) 3
- 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 3
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 3

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (*add above amounts*) 21
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 91
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: 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)*

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	<u>0</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>2</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>3</u>

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	<u>4</u>
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d	<u>3</u>
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d	<u>3</u>
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d	<u>4</u>
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a	<u>3</u>
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d	<u>4</u>

Impact (10 points max)

Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic - Section b	<u>2</u>
Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section c	<u>5</u>

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>3</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>3</u>

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	<u>3</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>3</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>3</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>4</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 52

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

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 2
- ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities 0
- 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) 0
- v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget 2
- 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*) 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	<u>1</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>2</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>3</u>

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

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>3</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>2</u>

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	<u>4</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>3</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>3</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>3</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 43

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

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 2
- 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) 10
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 53
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 (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	<u>3</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>3</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>3</u>

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	<u>4</u>
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d	<u>4</u>
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d	<u>3</u>
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d	<u>3</u>
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a	<u>4</u>
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d	<u>4</u>

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)Greater

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

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	<u>4</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>3</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>3</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>5</u>

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

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 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 3
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 2

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (*add above amounts*) 18
MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

Project Idea(s): Proposal identified specific zones	0	1	2	3	4	5	<u>3</u>
---	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------

GRAND TOTAL 84
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: 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)*

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	<u>3</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>3</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>2</u>

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	<u>2</u>
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d	<u>4</u>
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d	<u>4</u>
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d	<u>3</u>
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a	<u>2</u>
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d	<u>4</u>

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>3</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>3</u>

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	<u>3</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>4</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>4</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>4</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 46

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

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 2
- 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) 2
- iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s) 1
- v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget 3
- vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping 1
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 2

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (*add above amounts*) 12
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 58
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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	<u>1</u>
Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i	<u>1</u>
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l	<u>2</u>

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	<u>1</u>
Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables - Section d	<u>3</u>
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section d	<u>3</u>
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section d	<u>3</u>
Tasks in Section d expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section a	<u>2</u>
Project schedule in Section g specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section d	<u>3</u>

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section h	<u>2</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section f	<u>3</u>

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	<u>3</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) – Section d	<u>3</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range – Section d	<u>3</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section j	<u>3</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 42

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

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 2
- 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) 2
- iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s) 1
- v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget 1
- vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping 1
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 1

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 51
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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.