Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Contra Costa Service Integration  Project Name: Building Young Men and Women Afterschool Program

Reviewer: Justin Sullivan  Date: 2/8/2016

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

| 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
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

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

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

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

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

GRAND TOTAL  
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?  
The proposal is comprehensive and builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigating Fee funded strategies.

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

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):  
The proposal does not identify problems associated with illegal dumping that will be addressed through the project (Section D. of application).

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Possibly. Staff would require a different fiscal sponsor other than CHDC since CHDC currently administers non-profit contracts with the County. If funded, all applicable requirements to substantiate different fiscal sponsor would be required. (IRS Form 990, California Business Portal Printout, Proof of 501(c)(3) status)
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Public Agency
Project Name: CCC Service Integration, Family Service Ctr. Building Youth Men and Women Afterschool Program

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

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

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

<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 95
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?
The hands on experience is a great opportunity for kids to learn how to beautify and keep North Richmond clean and safe. I loved the benefits this proposal rings in teaching individuals healthy lifestyles.

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: CURME
Project Name: Lots of Crops
Reviewer: Justin Sullivan
Date: 2/8/2016

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only):
- [ ] One-Time Community-Based Project
- [x] 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)**
51
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>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)</td>
<td>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>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) 16

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 3

GRAND TOTAL 70

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?
The proposal has clear, measurable outcomes and will provide evidence to support these results. The proposal also sustain the project beyond the funding cycle by utilizing the resources they develop during the funding cycle.

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

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
The proposal focuses on waste reduction techniques and proper disposal methods, but provided little detail about how the community would be educated on these techniques and methods.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Yes. However staff needs a revised budget for Task 1.
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Communities Restoring Mother Earth  Project Name: Lots of Crops

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown  Date: 2/9/2016

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  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)

- Page 1 of 2 -
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).  

| 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)  
MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS  
21

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

GRAND TOTAL
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

94

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?  
Clear goals and objectives for reducing neighborhood blight and engaging residents in healthy eating and gardening goals to discourage 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: $20k
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Davis Chapel                                        Project Name: Art & Math Program
Reviewer: Justin Sullivan                                      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       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
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
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       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
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
1
Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section J
2
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
2

**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
2
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)
1
Cost effective budget for each task (able to determine intended purpose or need for line items listed)
2
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
2

**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).

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

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts) 11

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 62

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?
The proposal is centered in the Mitigation Funding area and focuses on educating youth. It brings together academic learning and fosters creative thinking.

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

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
The budget and actions outlined to complete each task are unclear. Staff would like clarification on what will be accomplished under each task and how the project will provide measurable outcomes with sound evidence. The proposal should have included more information about the data that would be collected and how it would be analyzed.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Possibly. The actions under each task and how they will measure effectiveness is still unclear.
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Davis Chapel Christian Methodist Eps.Chr
Project Name: Davis Chapel Neighborhood Enhancement ART& MATH Program
Date: 2/9/2016

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only):

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
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.

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)

48
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).  

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

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): 1

GRAND TOTAL = 69

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?  
Clear goals and objectives but unsure of how these goals and objectives meet the strategies for reducing neighborhood blight and discouraging 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: $10k
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Davis Chapel

Project Name: Community Garden DCNET

Reviewer: Justin Sullivan

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

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 I

*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)
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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

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).  

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

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

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

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

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?  
The project is located within the NRMF funding area and tasks can be easily verified with sound documentation.

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

**COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):**  
Staff has concerns with documenting the success of the project and would like more details on how the project will be implemented. There are also concerns with the lack of partnership with other entities and impact the project will have.

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:** No. A majority (70%) of the budget was towards lumber. Money could be better spent and the project could go further than just posting signage around the community.
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: 501C3
Project Name: Davis Chapel Enhancement Team
Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown
Date: 2/8/2016

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 PRIORITIZATION SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)
**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**

93

*MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS*

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

The hands on experience is a great opportunity for kids to learn how to beautify and keep North Richmond clean and safe. I loved the benefits this proposal rings in teaching individuals healthy lifestyles.

**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:** $18k
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Neighborhood House of North Richmond  Project Name: Native Plant Communities Garden

Reviewer: Justin Sullivan  Date: 2/8/2016

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 l
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)  50
**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  
  - 2
- 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  
  - 3
- 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):______ 0 1 2 3 4 5 2

**GRAND TOTAL**  
66

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?  
The proposal is well balanced, addresses unmet needs related to illegal dumping and focuses on providing jobs to North Richmond residents.

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

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):  
The proposal is well thought out, but some actions needed to complete each task are unclear.

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:** Yes.
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Neighborhood House North Richmond
Project Name: North Richmond Native Plant Communities Garden

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown
Date: 2/10/2016

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.

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 l 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 4

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 - ORprogram/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 5
Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P 5
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts) 75
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</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) 21
MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

Project Idea(s): 4

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

GRAND TOTAL 100
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

I loved the approach to maintaining native plants community gardens and engaging residents of all ages to participate.

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: Urban Tilth  
North Richmond Gardens  

Reviewer: Justin Sullivan  
Date: 2/8/2016  

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>
<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>

**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 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5:</th>
<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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 4 |
| 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 |
| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 |
| 3 |
| Person(s) responsible for fiscal/contract management are experienced in ensuring contract compliance – Section P |
| 3 |
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 14)

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts) 54
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>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) 14
MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

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

GRAND TOTAL 70
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?
Tasks outlined in application effectively address problems identified with illegal dumping. Proposal has clear, measurable deliverables, which can be supported by sound evidence.

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

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
The project utilizes community members to assist with the reduction of illegal dumping and beautification of the 1st and Market garden location. Highlights include educational speakers, developing a community tool shed and installing a rain water catchment system. Staff would like more detail about the data that will be studied in monthly reports and how accountability will be maintained with the community tool shed.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Yes, contingent upon receiving a copy of current form 990 and documentation authorizing use of project site (garden site at 1st and Market st.).
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: 501C3
Project Name: North Richmond Cleanup Project
Date: 2/9/2016

Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown

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 PRIORIT SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)

Page 1 of 2
**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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Idea(s): 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL**

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

Clear goals and objectives for reducing neighborhood blight and engaging residents in healthy eating and gardening goals to discourage 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:** $20k
Applicant: Urban Tilth                                      Project Name: North Richmond Lavender Farm
Reviewer: Justin Sullivan                                  Date: 2/8/2016

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)

| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0 = inadequate</th>
<th>1 = weak</th>
<th>2 = average</th>
<th>3 = strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Capacity (9 points max)</td>
<td>Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff members responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section i Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using scores of 0-5: |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Description &amp; Concept (30 points max)</td>
<td>Problem(s) identified in Section D is/are consistent with the Purpose of the Mitigation Fee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks clearly identify each action that will be taken, including any deliverables – Sections E and I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks adequately described to confirm technical feasibility - Section E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Roles of applicable staff/interns are identified for each Task - Section J</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project schedule in Section M specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

| SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts) | 52 |
## Funding Priorities

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

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

12

**MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS**

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

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

**GRAND TOTAL**

69

**MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS**

---

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

The tasks outlined in the proposal will address illegal dumping in the North Richmond area. The proposal also aims to create a self-sustaining project that should continue beyond North Richmond Mitigation fee funding cycle.

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

No.

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

The proposal is very creative and aims to address illegal dumping in a unique way. Staff has concerns regarding outcomes and how the proposal will provide sufficient evidence that measure the success of the project.

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Yes.**
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: 501C3
Project Name: North Richmond Lavender Farm

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

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

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

Project Description & Concept (30 points max)
Problem(s) identified in Section 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)

68
Funding Priorities

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = weak</th>
<th>2 = average</th>
<th>3 = strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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)**

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

Project Idea(s): 5

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

**GRAND TOTAL**

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

94

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?
The hands on experience is a great opportunity for kids to learn how to beautify and keep North Richmond clean and safe. I loved the benefits this proposal rings in teaching individuals healthy lifestyles.

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