

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: City of Richmond

Project Name: Love Your Block

Reviewer: Demian Hardman

Date: 2/5/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N 3
 Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L 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) 5
 Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) 5
 Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range 5
 Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 5

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 74

North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

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). 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 3
- vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping 2
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 1

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): 2 0 1 2 3 4 5 0

GRAND TOTAL 90

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

Project Description and concept is well thought out and easy to understand.

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

No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

Would like to have had more detail on measurable outcomes to demonstrate level of success. However, overall it is very well thought out project.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Yes, Recommend funding. Very Good Project.

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Public Agency

Project Name: Love Your Block No. Richmond

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown

Date: 2/8/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N 4
 Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L 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) 4
 Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) 4
 Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range 4
 Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 5

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 75

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): 3 0 1 2 3 4 5 3

GRAND TOTAL 97
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

This was an effective proposal that meets the goals and objectives of the North Richmond Mitigation. I loved that the proposal is inclusive of residents, businesses, and the clergy.

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

No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

N/A

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: \$30k

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: City of Richmond Restroom

Project Name: Shields Reid Park

Reviewer: Demian Hardman

Date: 2/5/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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 2
 Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l 3

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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 D is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee 0
 Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables – Sections E and I 3
 Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section E 3
 Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section J 3
 Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D 0
 Project schedule in Section M specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section E 4

Impact (10 points max)

Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic – Section E 0
 Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section R 4

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N 4
 Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L 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) 3
 Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) 3
 Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range 2
 Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 4

North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

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). 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 1
- 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 3

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 **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?
Clear measurable deliverables, and providing on-going service proposed project.

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?
No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
Did not complete the "Project Description and Concept" Section of the document (Section D) that describes how tasks are expected to be accomplished to address problems related to illegal dumping.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: No, Proposed Project Budget is very large and does not involve partnerships with others or community engagement. Project does not build on existing NRMF funded activities and does not provide jobs for the local youth or others.

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: City of Richmond Public Works

Project Name: Shields Reid Park Restroom

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown

Date: 2/8/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N 5
 Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L 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) 4
 Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) 4
 Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range 4
 Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 5

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 74

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):4 0 1 2 3 4 5 4

GRAND TOTAL 99
 MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?
 The Shield-Reid Park has been needing a restroom for a number of years. The construction of a restroom will assist with meeting the goals and objectives set forth in the North Richmond Mitigation Plan efforts. The proposal justifies that the absence of a restroom creates more opportunity for blight and illegal dumping.

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?
No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
N/A

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: \$30k

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Davis Chapel

Project Name: Davis Chapel Community Impact

Reviewer: Demian Hardman

Date: 2/5/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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 2

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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 D is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee 3
 Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables – Sections E and I 4
 Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section E 3
 Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section J 4
 Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D 3
 Project schedule in Section M specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section E 4

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N 3
 Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L 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) 4
 Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) 4
 Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range 3
 Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 4

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

North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

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). 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) 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) 13

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

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

GRAND TOTAL 72

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

Budget and tasks are reasonable, and answered all questions in application.

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

No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

Like idea of community Policing Task (Task 2) in application. Could have had more info on measurable outcomes to substantiate project deliverables.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Possible.

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: 501C3

Project Name: Davis Chapel Community Impact

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown

Date: 2/8/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N 4
 Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L 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) 4
 Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) 4
 Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range 4
 Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 5

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 68

North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

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). 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):3 0 1 2 3 4 5 3

GRAND TOTAL 92

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

I loved the tool library strategy and engaging the community and children in this process.

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

No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

N/A

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: \$20k

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Men & Women of Valor
Working Together

Project Name: Communty

Reviewer: Demian Hardman

Date: 2/5/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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

2

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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 D is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee

4

Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables – Sections E and I

3

Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section E

3

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

4

Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D

3

Project schedule in Section M specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section E

3

Impact (10 points max)

Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic – Section E

3

Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets

3

those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section R

3

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N

3

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

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)

3

Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed)

3

Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range

2

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

1

North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts) 43
 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). 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) 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 1
- 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) 11
 MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed (extra 5 points for this Category) -
 Project Idea(s): 4 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?
Project has many creative aspects and is consistent with the purpose of the mitigation fee.

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?
There had been some issues several years ago regarding working with a fiscal sponsor. A majority of the required submittal documents were incomplete or missing. Unable to verify formal proof of current Non-profit status. Upon additional review by County staff, the California Business Portal states Men and Women of Valor’s license is currently suspended as of 02/02/2016.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
Ensure all documentation is up to date and that all questions in the application are answered completely. Otherwise the proposal was very creative and had a good focus on educating youth in the community.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Not Recommended. No current proof of 501(c)(3) status and not on record with the California Secretary of State Business Portal.

North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

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). 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 2

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts) 20

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

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

GRAND TOTAL 95

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

I loved the idea of a mascot and engaging the mascot within the schools and throughout the community I also loved the idea if yard signage and utilizing the City's and I-80 electronic LED signs to educate the public and north Richmond residents about illegal dumping, primarily because others who often dumb are outside North Richmond.

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

No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

N/A

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: \$30k

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: REACH

Project Name: North Richmond Cleanup Project

Reviewer: Demian Hrdman

Date: 2/5/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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 D is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee 3
 Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables – Sections E and I 2
 Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section E 0
 Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section J 4
 Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D 0
 Project schedule in Section M specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section E 4

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N 4
 Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L 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) 4
 Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) 4
 Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range 3
 Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 4

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 49

North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

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). 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): 1 0 1 2 3 4 5 0

GRAND TOTAL 68

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

The proposed project has clear, measurable goals. The project will provide jobs for North Richmond residents and partners with other entities.

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

No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

Proposal did not include Section E. ("Describe the tasks your proposed project is expected to accomplish to address the problems you identified in Section D"). Proposal not clear if proposed clean ups are to be done in Public Right-of-Way or on private property.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:

Possibly.

North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: 501C3
 Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown

Project Name: North Richmond Cleanup Project
 Date: 2/9/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N 5
 Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L 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) 5
 Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) 5
 Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range 4
 Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 5

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 69

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): 4 0 1 2 3 4 5 4

GRAND TOTAL 94
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

Great demographics and an understanding of North Richmond, the progress and the resolutions to achieve excellence and community awareness. The proposal addressed much needed goals and effective ways to accomplish the goals. The activities suggested will ensure less blight on vacant properties and promote less illegal dumping.

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

No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

N/A

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: \$30k

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Urban Tilith

Project Name: Richmond Tool Lending Library

Reviewer: Demian Hardman

Date: 2/5/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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 2
 Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond– Section l 2

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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 D is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee 2
 Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables – Sections E and I 2
 Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section E 3
 Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section J 3
 Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D 2
 Project schedule in Section M specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section E 3

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N 3
 Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L 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) 3
 Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) 3
 Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range 4
 Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 3

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

North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

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). 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 2
- 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 2

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): New proposal. Interesting concept. 0 1 2 3 4 5 3

GRAND TOTAL 64

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

Creative concept.

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

Unclear as to who is the applicant. Application contact info from City of Richmond, but Fiscal Sponsor and Applicant listed as Urban Tilth.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

Not clear on location(s) that the Mobile Tool Lending Library would be staged (i.e other permits may be required to be located on Public/Private property). Proposal not entirely clear. Good unique concept, but should have provided more detail on how to implement activity.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Possible, but would need to provide a substantial amount of information to get better understanding of proposed project.

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: 501C3

Project Name: Richmond Tool Lending Library

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown

Date: 2/8/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N 4
 Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L 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) 4
 Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed) 4
 Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range 4
 Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 5

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 72

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):	3	0	1	2	3	4	5	3
------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

GRAND TOTAL 96
 MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

I loved the tool library strategy and engaging the community and children in this process.

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

No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

N/A

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: \$28k

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Voyages

Project Name: Verde Eco-Steward Voyage

Reviewer: Demian Hardman

Date: 2/5/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
 Community Garden Project

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 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>2</u>

***If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.**

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 D 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 – Sections E and I	<u>3</u>
Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section E	<u>3</u>
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section J	<u>5</u>
Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D	<u>3</u>
Project schedule in Section M specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section E	<u>5</u>

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N	<u>4</u>
Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L	<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)	<u>4</u>
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed)	<u>4</u>
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range	<u>4</u>
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P	<u>5</u>

SUBTOTAL – Base Score *(add above amounts)* 59

North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

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

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): Use of Technology for Education Purposes 0 1 2 3 4 5 2

GRAND TOTAL 73

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

Proposal focuses on educating youth with direction from highly qualified individuals. Project has clear, measurable goals.

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

No previous experience partnering with applicant or Fiscal Sponsor. Application missing letter from previous funder to substantiate fiscal responsibility. Application is also missing written agreement between applicant and fiscal sponsor, including proof of fiscal sponsors status as a 501(c)(3).

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

Creative concept that involves the use of technology to engage North Richmond youth.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Yes, contingent upon receiving required fiscal sponsor documentation.

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) 2
- 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) 19
MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

GRAND TOTAL 83
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?
The proposal mentioned having a bus contract, itinerary, and digital posters that will assist with documenting study trips to Wastewater treatment plants. Very effective

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?
No.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
N/A

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: \$25k