NRMF 2018/19 COMMUNITY BASED PROJECT (CBP)
FUNDING REQUEST APPLICATION/PROPOSAL
ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST

APPLICANT ORGANIZATION: CITY OF RICHMOND
FISCAL SPONSOR (FS): N/A
APPLICATION FOR FUNDING: One-Time Community Based Project

☑ Received by 5pm deadline on 3/6/2018. Time = 1:40 / Date = 3/6/18
☑ Electronic Application/Proposal in Word (editable). IF NO, how submitted?
☐ Scanned copy (non-editable) sent via e-mail by non-profit organization, OR
☐ Submitted hardcopy to City staff who scanned/e-mailed to County staff.

☑ Contact Info for Applicant listed on Page 1.
☑ Applicant signed Acknowledgement Page.
☐ Board of Directors list provided. (Gov. Agency)
☐ Most recent (current) IRS Form 990. (Gov. Agency)
☐ Copy of California Business Portal Printout. (Gov. Agency)
☐ Commitment Letters for all approved funding sources, if applicable.
☐ Proof of 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(6) – IF NO:
☐ Contact Info for Fiscal Sponsor listed on Page 1.
☐ Fiscal Sponsor signed Acknowledgement Page.
☐ Written agreement with Fiscal Sponsor included.
☐ Fiscal Sponsor’s Proof of 501(c)(3) included.

☐ Proposal questions all completed, unless noted as optional [Section R] on Page 8 – IF NO: Which questions left blank/unanswered?
☐ Written authorization signed by Property Owner(s). (Notarized? ☐)
☐ Copy(ies) of letter(s) from Applicant or Fiscal Sponsor past funder(s) – IF NO:
☐ Recipient of NRMF funding in the past – IF YES:
Identify any issues/problems encountered administering the proposing Organization’s previously funded project (e.g. contract compliance, invoicing/progress report adequacy, above average amount of staff time/effort required, etc.)

☐ Letter(s) of recommendation or support [OPTIONAL]
☐ Letter requesting advance payment [OPTIONAL]

ATTACH COMPLETED ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST TO APPLICABLE CBP EVALUATION SHEET(S)

REVIEWER NAME: JUSTIN SULLIVAN
DATE REVIEWED: March 8, 2018

# of Requirements Not Met (NOS) = 0
Max Incomplete Points = 13 (if no FS) or 16 (if FS)
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: CITY OF RICHMOND
Project Name: LOVE YOUR BLOCK

Reviewer: DEMIAN HARDMAN & JUSTIN SULLIVAN
Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): □ One-Time Community-Based Project  
 OR  
 □ Community Garden Project

Date: 3/8/18

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 N
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond—Section Q

*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:
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/teams are identified for each Task - Section J
Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D
Project schedule for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task – Section I

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 Q

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

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 & 12)

Funding Priorities

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

1 = weak  
2 = average  
3 = strong

i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents  
  3

ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities  
  3

iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)  
  3

iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)  
  3

v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget  
  3

vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping  
  3

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

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

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

Project Idea(s): ____ 0 1 2 3 4 5 0 INCORPORATES SPECIAL COORDINATION WITH SENIOR RESIDENTS

GRAND TOTAL 
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS  
99

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

___ WELL WRITTEN & VERY DETAIL ORIENTED

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

___ NO

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S): 

___ GREAT PROPOSAL

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: ___ YES

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS  
Has the organization been awarded funding in the past?  ___ YES/No  ___ YES

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category  

7

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating) 

- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: City of Richmond

Reviewer: Lori Reese Brown

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only):

☑ One-Time Community-Based Project

OR

☐ Community Garden Project

Date: 3-15-18

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 N
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond - Section Q

*If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with at 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/teams are identified for each Task - Section J
Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D
Project schedule for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section I

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 Q

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence - Section M
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 O

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 |

Total Score: 73
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 & 12)

i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents

ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities

iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)

iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)

v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget

vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping

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

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

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

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

GRAND TOTAL
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

Specific objectives for meeting program expectations.

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

No

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
Proposal well organized with specific objectives

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Yes

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS
Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? Yes/No

Yes

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category
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If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)

- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.
NRMF 2018/19 COMMUNITY BASED PROJECT (CBP) FUNDING REQUEST APPLICATION/PROPOSAL ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST

APPLICANT ORGANIZATION: CITY OF RICHMOND
FISCAL SPONSOR (FS): N/A
APPLICATION FOR FUNDING: One-Time Community Based Project [x] Community Garden Project [ ]

☑ = YES / ☐ = NO then circle # "Missing". If not applicable, circle N/A to the left.

☒ Received by 5pm deadline on 3/6/2018. Time = 4:41 / Date = 3/6/18
☒ Electronic Application/Proposal in Word (editable), IF NO, how submitted?
☐ Scanned copy (non-editable) sent via e-mail by non-profit organization, OR
☐ Submitted hardcopy to City staff who scanned/e-mailed to County staff.

☒ Contact Info for Applicant listed on Page 1.
☒ Applicant signed Acknowledgement Page.
☐ Board of Directors list provided.
☐ Most recent (current) IRS Form 990.
☐ Copy of California Business Portal Printout.
☐ Commitment Letters for all approved funding sources, if applicable.
☐ Proof of 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(6)– IF NO:
☐ Contact Info for Fiscal Sponsor listed on Page 1.
☐ Fiscal Sponsor signed Acknowledgement Page.
☐ Written agreement with Fiscal Sponsor included.
☐ Fiscal Sponsor’s Proof of 501(c)(3) included.

☐ Proposal questions all completed, unless noted as optional [Section R on Page 8] – IF NO: Which questions left blank/unanswered? _____

☒ Written authorization signed by Property Owner(s). (Notarized? [ ])
☐ Copy(ies) of letter(s) from Applicant or Fiscal Sponsor past funder(s) – IF NO:
☒ Recipient of NRMF funding in the past – IF YES:
Identify any issues/problems encountered administering the proposing Organization’s previously funded project (e.g. contract compliance, invoicing/progress report adequacy, above average amount of staff time/effort required, etc.)

☐ Letter(s) of recommendation or support [OPTIONAL]
☐ Letter requesting advance payment [OPTIONAL]

ATTACH COMPLETED ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST TO APPLICABLE CBP EVALUATION SHEET(S)

REVIEWER NAME: [Signature] JUSTIN SULLIVAN
DATE REVIEWED: March 8, 2018

# of Requirements Not Met (NOs) = 
Max Incomplete Points = 13 (if no FS) or 16 (if FS)
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: CITY OF RICHMOND  Project Name: MOBILE TOOL LENDING LIBRARY

Reviewer: DEMIAN HARDMAN & JUSTIN SULLIVAN  Date: 3/8/18
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 N
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section Q
*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: |
|-----------------------------------|------------------|
| 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/interim are identified for each Task - Section J
Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D
Project schedule for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task – Section I

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 Q

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

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 9 & 12)

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

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

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

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

GRAND TOTAL  
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS  

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

_____ WELL WRITTEN & VERY DETAIL ORIENTED

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

_____ NO

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):  

_____ IDEAL PROJECT FOR FUNDING

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:  

YES

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS  

Has the organization been awarded funding in the past?  

Yes \(\checkmark\) No 

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)

- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: City of Richmond
Project Name: Mobile Tool Lending Library
Reviewer: Leni Reese - Brown
Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): ☑ One-Time Community-Based Project
OR ☐ Community Garden Project
Date: 3/15/18

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

*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:

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/items are identified for each Task - Section J
Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D
Project schedule for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task – Section I

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 Q

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

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

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

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

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

GRAND TOTAL
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?
Proposal meets expectations of the request. Well written or organized.

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: yes

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS
Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? Yes/No yes

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)
- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.
NRMF 2018/19 COMMUNITY BASED PROJECT (CBP)
FUNDING REQUEST APPLICATION/PROPOSAL
ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST

APPLICANT ORGANIZATION:  URBAN TILTH
FISCAL SPONSOR (FS):  N/A
APPLICATION FOR FUNDING:  One-Time Community Based Project ✗ Community Garden Project ☐

☑ = YES / ☐ = NO then circle # "Missing". If not applicable, circle N/A to the left.

☒ Received by 5pm deadline on 3/6/2018. Time = 4:53 / Date = 3/6/18
☒ Electronic Application/Proposal in Word (editable). IF NO, how submitted?
☐ Scanned copy (non-editable) sent via e-mail by non-profit organization, OR
☐ Submitted hardcopy to City staff who scanned/e-mailed to County staff.
☐ Contact Info for Applicant listed on Page 1.
☒ Applicant signed Acknowledgement Page.
☐ Board of Directors list provided.
☒ Most recent (current) IRS Form 990.
☒ Copy of California Business Portal Printout.
☒ Commitment Letters for all approved funding sources, if applicable. N/A
☒ Proof of 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(6)– IF NO: (from 2006)
☐ Contact Info for Fiscal Sponsor listed on Page 1.
☐ Fiscal Sponsor signed Acknowledgement Page.
☐ Written agreement with Fiscal Sponsor included.
☐ Fiscal Sponsor’s Proof of 501(c)(3) included.
☒ Proposal questions all completed, unless noted as optional [Section R] on Page 8] – IF NO: Which questions left blank/unanswered?

N/A (no FS)

☒ Written authorization signed by Property Owner(s). (Notarized? ☐)
☐ Copy(ies) of letter(s) from Applicant or Fiscal Sponsor past funder(s) – IF NO:
☒ Recipient of NRMF funding in the past – IF YES:
Identify any issues/problems encountered administering the proposing Organization’s previously funded project (e.g. contract compliance, invoicing/progress report adequacy, above average amount of staff time/effort required, etc.)
☐ Letter(s) of recommendation or support [OPTIONAL]
☐ Letter requesting advance payment [OPTIONAL] N/A

ATTACH COMPLETED ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST TO APPLICABLE CBP EVALUATION

REVIEWER NAME:  ♦ JUSTIN SULLIVAN
DATE REVIEWED:  March 12, 2018

G:\Conservation\Deidra\Illegal Dumping\BMPC Mitigation Fee Committee\EPhs2017-2018 Exp Plan\RFP Docs\RFP Proposals Received\EligibilityChecklist_revDH.doc

# of Requirements Not Met (NOs) = 1
Max Incomplete Points = 13 (if no FS) or 16 (if FS)
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: URBAN TILTH  Project Name: WATER IS LIFE

Reviewer: DENNIS HARDMAN & JUSTIN SULLIVAN  Date: 3/12/18
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 N
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond - Section Q
*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>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 for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section I

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 Q

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence - Section M
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 O

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 9 & 12)

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 i  3

ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities ii  2

iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s) iii  1

iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s) iv  2

v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget v  3

vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping vi  2

vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts vii  1

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts)

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

1 4

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

73

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

- Past success with projects
- Clear & measurable outcomes

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

- Old proof of SDF(1)(3) status

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

- Organization does great work in community

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: YES

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDERS SUCCESS

Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? (Yes/No)  

- Yes

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)

- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Urban Tilth
Project Name: Water is Life
Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown
Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only): ☑ One-Time Community-Based Project
OR
☐ Community Garden Project
Date: 3/15/18

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

*If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with at 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/firms are identified for each Task - Section J
Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D
Project schedule for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task – Section I

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 Q

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

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

i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents
   3

ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities
   3

iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)
   1

iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)
   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
   2

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

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

GRAND TOTAL
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?
5b1 C 3 Status/Update was questionable.

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
Project is specific on addressing PPP goals/objectives.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Yes

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS
Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? Yes/No Yes

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)
- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s),
  including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.

- Page 2 of 2 -
NRMF 2018/19 COMMUNITY BASED PROJECT (CBP)
FUNDING REQUEST APPLICATION/PROPOSAL
ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST

APPLICANT ORGANIZATION: Safe Reivan Project
FISCAL SPONSOR (FS): Social Good Fund
APPLICATION FOR FUNDING: One-Time Community Based Project
Community Garden Project

☑ YES / ☐ NO then circle # "Missing". If not applicable, circle N/A to the left.
☐ Received by 5pm deadline on 3/6/2018. Time = 5:04 / Date = 3/6/18
☐ Electronic Application/Proposal in Word (editable). IF NO, how submitted?
☒ Scanned copy (non-editable) sent via e-mail by non-profit organization, OR
☐ Submitted hardcopy to City staff who scanned/e-mailed to County staff.
☒ Contact Info for Applicant listed on Page 1.
☒ Applicant signed Acknowledgement Page.
☒ Board of Directors list provided.
☐ Most recent (current) IRS Form 990.
☐ Copy of California Business Portal Printout.
☐ Commitment Letters for all approved funding sources, if applicable.
☐ Proof of 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(6) – IF NO:
☒ Contact Info for Fiscal Sponsor listed on Page 1.
☒ Fiscal Sponsor signed Acknowledgement Page.
☒ Written agreement with Fiscal Sponsor included.
☒ Fiscal Sponsor’s Proof of 501(c)(3) included.
☐ Proposal questions all completed, unless noted as optional [Section R] on Page 8 – IF NO: Which questions left blank/unanswered?

N/A (no FS)

☐ Written authorization signed by Property Owner(s). (Notarized? ☐)
☐ Copy(ies) of letter(s) from Applicant or Fiscal Sponsor past funder(s) – IF NO:
☐ Recipient of NRMF funding in the past – IF YES:
Identify any issues/problems encountered administering the proposing Organization’s previously funded project (e.g. contract compliance, invoicing/progress report adequacy, above average amount of staff time/effort required, etc.)

☐ Letter(s) of recommendation or support [OPTIONAL]
☒ Letter requesting advance payment [OPTIONAL]

ATTACH COMPLETED ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST TO APPLICABLE CBP EVALUATION SHEET(S)

REVIEWER NAME: Justin Sullivan
DATE REVIEWED: March 8, 2018

# of Requirements Not Met (Nos) = 5
Max Incomplete Points = 13 (if no FS) or 16 (if FS)
**North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)**

**Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation**

Applicant: **SAFE RETURN**  
Project Name: **SAFE RETURN PROJECT**

Reviewer: **DEMIAN HARDMAN & JUSTIN SULLIVAN**  
Date: **3/8/18**

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

*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: |
|------------------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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/interms are identified for each Task - Section J
- Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D
- Project schedule for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task – Section I

**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 Q

**Outcomes (10 points max)**
- Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section M
- 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 fine 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 O

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

**MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 70 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)**

- Page 1 of 2 -
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 & 12)

Funding Priorities

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

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts)

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

| Task 3 of Proposal Includes New Approach to Address Old Problems | 0 |

GRAND TOTAL

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

___ Creative Approach to Addressing Existing Problems

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

___ Will Permits Be Needed for Blvd / Fenceline

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

___ Missing Multiple Proposal Submission Requirements

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: NO

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS

Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? Yes/No

___ No

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category

___ N/A

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)

- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Safe Return

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)

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 N
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond - Section Q

"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:

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/teams are identified for each Task - Section J
Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D
Project schedule for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section I

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 Q

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence - Section M
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 O

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

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 different entities 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)
MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

20

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

67

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?
The proposal goals were well presented to address North Richmond problems.

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

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
Unmet Proposal Requirements.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Yes

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS
Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? Yes/No
No

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category

N/A

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)
- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.
**NRMF 2018/19 Community Based Project (CBP) Funding Request Application/Proposal Eligibility Checklist**

**Applicant Organization:** Watershed Project

**Fiscal Sponsor (FS):**
- One-Time Community Based Project
- Community Garden Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Yes/No</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received by 5pm deadline on 3/6/2018. Time = 4:57 PM / Date = 3/6/18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Application/Proposal in Word (editable). If NO, how submitted?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted copy (non-editable) sent via e-mail by non-profit organization, or</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted hardcopy to City staff who scanned/e-mailed to County staff.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Info for Applicant listed on Page 1.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant signed Acknowledgement Page.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors list provided.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most recent (current) IRS Form 990.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of California Business Portal Printout. (NOT PULLED ONLINE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Letters for all approved funding sources, if applicable.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(6)—IF NO: DECADE OLD (2008)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Info for Fiscal Sponsor listed on Page 1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Sponsor signed Acknowledgement Page.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written agreement with Fiscal Sponsor included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Sponsor’s Proof of 501(c)(3) included.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal questions all completed, unless noted as optional [Section R] on Page 8—IF NO: Which questions left blank/unanswered?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written authorization signed by Property Owner(s). (Notarized? NO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy(ies) of letter(s) from Applicant or Fiscal Sponsor past funder(s)—IF NO:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient of NRMF funding in past—IF YES: Identify any issues/problems encountered administering the proposing Organization’s previously funded project (e.g. contract compliance, invoicing/progress report adequacy, above average amount of staff time/effort required, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter(s) of recommendation or support [OPTIONAL]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter requesting advance payment [OPTIONAL]</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Attach completed eligibility checklist to applicable CBP evaluation sheet(s)**

**Reviewer Name:** Justin Sullivan

**Date Reviewed:** March 12, 2018

# of Requirements Not Met (NOs) = 0
Max Incomplete Points = 13 (if no FS) or 16 (if FS)
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: WATERSHED PROJECT  Project Name: CURB APPEAL

Reviewer: DEMIAN HARDMAN & JUSTIN SULLIVAN  Date: 3/12/18
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 N
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section Q

"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: |
|---------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 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/teams are identified for each Task - Section J
Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D
Project schedule for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task – Section I

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 Q

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

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

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

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

**GRAND TOTAL**

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

--- **REASONABLE TASK SCHEDULE** ---

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

--- **CONCERNS WITH ONGOING SUSTAINABILITY AFTER FUNDING PERIOD AND PROOF FOR SD1(H) STATUS** ---

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

--- **CLARIFICATION NEEDED FOR PROJECT LOCATION. APPLICATION INDICATES PRIVATE PROPERTY & RIGHT OF WAY ARE INCLUDED IN PROJECTS** ---

**FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:** NO

**SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS**

Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? **Yes/No**

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)

- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.

--- Page 2 of 2 ---
North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 or 12)

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Watershed Project
Reviewer: Lori Reese Brown

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

Date: 3/15/18

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) is 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 N
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond - Section Q

"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:
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 for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task - Section I

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 Q

Outcomes (10 points max)
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence - Section M
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 O

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

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

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

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

GRAND TOTAL
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant's proposed project?
— The Schedule + Timing

Are you aware of any concerns about this Applicant, Fiscal Sponsor or proposed project?
— Proof of 501 c 3 Status

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
— Project cannot proceed unless location has been identified. Questionable

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: No

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS
Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? Yes No ___

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)
- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.
# NRMF 2018/19 Community Based Project (CBP) Funding Request Application/Proposal Eligibility Checklist

**Applicant Organization:** Social Progress

**Fiscal Sponsor (FS):** GRIP

**Application for Funding:**
- One-Time Community Based Project
- Community Garden Project

## Missing Submittal Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received by 5pm deadline on 3/6/2018. Time = 4:02 / Date = 3/6/18</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Application/Proposal in Word (editable). IF NO, how submitted?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scanned copy (non-editable) sent via e-mail by non-profit organization,</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR Submitted hardcopy to City staff who scanned/e-mailed to County staff.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Info for Applicant listed on Page 1.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant signed Acknowledgement Page.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Directors list provided.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most recent (current) IRS Form 990.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy of California Business Portal Printout.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment Letters for all approved funding sources, if applicable.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proof of 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(6) – IF NO:</td>
<td>1 or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Info for Fiscal Sponsor listed on Page 1.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Sponsor signed Acknowledgement Page.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written agreement with Fiscal Sponsor included.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal Sponsor’s Proof of 501(c)(3) included.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal questions all completed, unless noted as optional (Section R on Page 8) – IF NO: Which questions left blank/unanswered?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written authorization signed by Property Owner(s). (Notarized? No)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copy(ies) of letter(s) from Applicant or Fiscal Sponsor past funder(s) – IF NO:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient of NRMF funding in the past – IF YES:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify any issues/problems encountered administering the proposing Organization’s previously funded project (e.g. contract compliance, invoicing/progress report adequacy, above average amount of staff time/effort required, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter(s) of recommendation or support [optional]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter requesting advance payment [optional]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reviewer Name:** Justin Sullivan

**Date Reviewed:** March 8, 2018

# of Requirements Not Met (NOs) = 1

Max Incomplete Points = 13 (if no FS) or 16 (if FS)
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: SOCIAL PROGRESS
Project Name: BRIGHTER BEGINNING IN NORTH RICHMOND

Reviewer: DEYMAH HARDMAN & JUSTIN SULLIVAN
Date: 3/8/18

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

Directions:
1. Only eligible completed Funding Request forms, 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) is/are in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist
Staffs responsible for Tasks in Section d) are adequately qualified – Section N
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section Q

*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:

| 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 for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task – Section I

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 Q

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

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 9 & 12)

Funding Priorities

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

i. Provide jobs and/or professional development/training opportunities for North Richmond residents  2
ii. Uses or builds upon existing North Richmond Mitigation Fee funded strategies/activities  3
iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)  1
iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s)  3
v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget  2
vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping  2
vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts  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):  0 1 2 3 4 5 0

GRAND TOTAL

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

ACTIVITIES PROPOSED ARE ALIGNED WITH EXISTING NRMF FUNDED STRATEGIES

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

NO

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: YES

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS

Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? Yes/No YES

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)

- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.
# Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

**Applicant:** Social Progress  
**Project Name:** Brighter Beg. in North Richmond  
**Reviewer:** Lori Reese Brown  
**Date:** 3/15/18

**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 = 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 N  
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section Q

*If Organization Capacity Category is not scored with at 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  
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/teams are identified for each Task - Section J  
Tasks in Section E expected to address/impact the Problem(s) identified in Section D  
Project schedule for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task – Section I

**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 Q

**Outcomes (10 points max)**  
Exhibits Clear and Measurable Outcomes with Sound Evidence – Section M  
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 O

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

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

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

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

GRAND TOTAL
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?
Activities proposed meet project program expectations.

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

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
The activities listed are duplicative however if applicant can meet these goals the city is pleased.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION: Yes

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS
Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? Yes

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)
- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.
NRMF 2018/19 COMMUNITY BASED PROJECT (CBP)
FUNDING REQUEST APPLICATION/PROPOSAL
ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST

APPLICANT ORGANIZATION: MEN & WOMEN OF VALOR
FISCAL SPONSOR (FS): One-Time Community Based Project
APPLICATION FOR FUNDING: Community Garden Project

☑ Received by 5pm deadline on 3/6/2018. Time = 2:56 / Date = 3/6/18
☐ Electronic Application/Proposal in Word (editable). IF NO, how submitted?
☐ Scanned copy (non-editable) sent via e-mail by non-profit organization,
OR
☐ Submitted hardcopy to City staff who scanned/e-mailed to County staff.
☐ Contact Info for Applicant listed on Page 1.
☐ Applicant signed Acknowledgement Page.
☒ Board of Directors list provided.  (ADDITIONAL INFO MAY BE NEEDED)
☒ Most recent (current) IRS Form 990. (COUNTRY STAFF PRINTED)
☐ Copy of California Business Portal Printout.
☐ Commitment Letters for all approved funding sources, if applicable. N/A
☐ Proof of 501(c)(3) or 501(c)(6)– IF NO:
☐ Contact Info for Fiscal Sponsor listed on Page 1.
☐ Fiscal Sponsor signed Acknowledgement Page.
☐ Written agreement with Fiscal Sponsor included.
☐ Fiscal Sponsor’s Proof of 501(c)(3) included.
☐ Proposal questions all completed, unless noted as optional [Section R] on Page 8) – IF NO: Which questions left blank/unanswered? ______
☐ Written authorization signed by Property Owner(s). (Notarized? ☐)
☐ Copy(ies) of letter(s) from Applicant or Fiscal Sponsor past funder(s) – IF NO:
☒ Recipient of NRMF funding in the past – IF YES: Identify any issues/problems encountered administering the proposing Organization’s previously funded project (e.g. contract compliance, invoicing/progress report adequacy, above average amount of staff time/effort required, etc.)
☐ Letter(s) of recommendation or support [OPTIONAL]
☐ Letter requesting advance payment [OPTIONAL]

N/A

ATTACH COMPLETED ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST TO APPLICABLE CBP EVALUATION SHEET(S)

REVIEWER NAME: JASON SULLIVAN
DATE REVIEWED: March 12, 2018

# of Requirements Not Met (NOs) = 6
Max Incomplete Points = 13 (if no FS) or 16 (if FS)

G:\Conservation\Deidra\Illegal Dumping\BMPC Mitigation Fee Committee\_E\Ps\2017-2018 Exp Plan\RFP Docs\RFP Proposals Received\EligibilityChecklist_revDH.doc
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Men Women of Valor
Project Name: Community Working Together
Reviewer: Lori Reese-Brown
Date: 3/15/2018

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: |
|-------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 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 N
Organization has previously provided services to those living/working in North Richmond – Section Q

*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: |
|-------------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 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 for Tasks specifies reasonable start/end dates for every Task – Section I

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 Q

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

SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)
MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)
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North Richmond Mitigation Fee - Community Based Project (Strategy 9 & 12)

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  
   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)  

18

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

Project Idea(s):  

GRAND TOTAL  

85

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?  
I like the approach to addressing illegal dumping and the strategies for meeting goals as identified in the North Richmond Mitigation Plan.

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

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):  
Great project that meet the expectations of mitigation efforts

FUNDING RECOMMENDATION:  Yes

SEPARATE EVALUATION ON PAST FUNDER SUCCESS  
Has the organization been awarded funding in the past? Yes/No  
No

If No, Indicate Not Applicable (N/A) for this Category  

If Yes, Contracting Agency (County or City, and CHDC) provide a score of 1 – 10 (10 being highest rating)  

- Score must consider overall organization effectiveness in implementing past project(s), including past ability to submit timely and complete invoices.