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  [ ] 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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Idea(s):</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**

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)

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

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

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

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

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)
Funding Priorities

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

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

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

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

**GRAND TOTAL**

**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

Reviewer: Demian Hardman

Project Name: Shields Reid Park

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ideal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)

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

*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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>inadequate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>very weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>ideal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)

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

Impact (10 points max)

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

Outcomes (10 points max)

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

Financially Sound (20 points max)

Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies)
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed)
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P
**North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)**

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

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

**Funding Priorities**

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

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

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

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

**GRAND TOTAL**

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

58

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

## 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):**  
- [X] One-Time Community-Based Project  
- [ ] 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Max Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Capacity</td>
<td>9 points max</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

### Impact (10 points max)

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

### Outcomes (10 points max)

- Exemplifies Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N  
- Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L

### Financially Sound (20 points max)

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

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

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

- 74
**North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)**

**Funding Priorities**

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

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

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

21

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**

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

99

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

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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)

- Page 1 of 2 –
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

GRAND TOTAL

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS 72

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section E

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

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

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

Impact (10 points max)
Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic – Section E

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

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N

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

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

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

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

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

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)

- Page 1 of 2 –
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**Funding Priorities**

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

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

21

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Idea(s):</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**

92

**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

Reviewer: Demian Hardman

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

Date: 2/5/2016

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)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Financially Sound (20 points max)
Costs per task adequately identifies the type(s) of expense, unit price(s)/hourly rate(s) and quantity(ies)
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed)
Budget per task is realistic and Administrative/Oversight amount within allowable range
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P
**North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)**

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

**Funding Priorities**

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

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

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

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

58

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.
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Men & Women of Valor  Project Name: Community Working Together

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown  Date: 2/8/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only):  X 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)

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

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

*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:

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

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 4
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 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 5
Project is located within NRFF Funding Area – OR program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRFF 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 NRFF – 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) 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
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

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

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

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):**  
- [X] One-Time Community-Based Project  
- [ ] 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) are in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) or NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist  
- Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i  
- Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l

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

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

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

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

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

GRAND TOTAL

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.
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: 501C3  Project Name: North Richmond Cleanup Project
Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown  Date: 2/9/2016

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)**
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE) 69
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

Funding Priorities

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

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

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

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

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

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

**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

| 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**

### New and/or Creative Project Ideas Proposed

| Project Idea(s): New proposal. Interesting concept. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 3 |

**GRAND TOTAL**

**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)

| 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.

| 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

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

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities *(add above amounts)*

**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**

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

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

GRAND TOTAL

**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):
- [x] One-Time Community-Based Project
- [ ] 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Capacity</strong> (9 points max)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with least a rating of “2” no additional scoring on the sheet is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Description &amp; Concept</strong> (30 points max)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem(s) identified in Section D is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables – Sections E and I</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section J</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project schedule in Section M specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact</strong> (10 points max)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Way in which project is expected to address Problem(s) seems realistic – Section E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project is located within NRMF Funding Area -OR- program/service provided within/targets those living in the NRMF Funding Area – Section R</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong> (10 points max)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section N</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Realistic plans to sustain proposed Project beyond the period funded by NRMF – Section L</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong> – Base Score (add above amounts)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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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

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

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts) | 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

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 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: _  Project Name: Verde Eco-Steward Voyage

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 = inadequate</th>
<th>1 = weak</th>
<th>2 = average</th>
<th>3 = strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

*If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with at 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 = inadequate</th>
<th>1 = very weak</th>
<th>2 = weak</th>
<th>3 = average</th>
<th>4 = strong</th>
<th>5 = ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

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

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

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

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

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

- Page 1 of 2 -
Funding Priorities

| i. | Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents | 3 |
| ii. | Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities | 3 |
| iii. | Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s) | 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

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