# 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 [X]

### Requirements

- [X] Received by 5pm deadline on 3/6/2018. Time = 2:02 / Date = 3/6/18
- [X] 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.
- [X] Contact Info for Applicant listed on Page 1.
- [X] Applicant signed Acknowledgement Page.
- [X] Board of Directors list provided.
- [X] Most recent (current) IRS Form 990.
- [X] Copy of California Business Portal Printout.
- □ Commitment Letters for all approved funding sources, if applicable.
- [X] 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.
- [X] 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]

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

Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: **URBAN TITTH**

Project Name: **CULTIVATING HOPE**

Reviewer: **DEMIAN HARMAN & JUSTIN SULLIVAN**

Application for Funding Requested (Check one box only):

- [X] Community Garden Project
- [ ] One-Time Community-Based 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)

<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/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)

- 71
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  
   Score: 3

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

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

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

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

vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping  
    Score: 2

vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts  
    Score: 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?  
___ CLEAR + MEASURABLE OUTCOMES, STRONG FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

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

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):  
___ ORGANIZATION DOES GREAT WORK IN COMMUNITY

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 -
Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

Applicant: Urban Tilth  
Project Name: Cultivating Hope  
Date: 3/15/18

Reviewer: Leisa 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
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): 3 0 1 2 3 4 5 0

GRAND TOTAL
MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?
- Measurable goals and outcomes

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

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):
- Organization has goals aligned with project expectations.

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: CURUME (LOTS OF CROPS)
FISCAL SPONSOR (FS): GRP
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 = 4:24 / Date = 3/6
☒ 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, 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: Demian Hagedorn
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: CURME

Project Name: LOTS OF CROPS

Reviewer: DEAN HARRI MAN & 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:

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

59
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).  

<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>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. Partnerships with a different entity(ies) currently proposing other Community Based Project(s)</td>
<td>3</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>2</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  
16

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  
75

What are the strongest areas of the applicant’s proposed project?  
CONCEPT TO SUSTAIN PROJECT WITHOUT MITIGATION FUNDING  
PROVEN HISTORY OF PROVIDING RESOURCES 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):  
NO

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.
### Funding Request Proposal & Application Evaluation

**Applicant:** Curme

**Project Name:** Lots of Chips

**Reviewer:** Lori Reese Brown

**Date:** 3/15/18

**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 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/itens are identified for each Task - Section J
- Tasks in Section E expected to address 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

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBTOTAL – Base Score (add above amounts)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAXIMUM BASE SCORE = 79 POINTS (NOT INCLUDING OPTIONAL FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE ON THE NEXT PAGE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

---
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?

—Ability to meet goals based on past experience.

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

—No

COMMENTS ABOUT PROJECT, SUBMITTALS OR ORGANIZATION(S):

—Great Project goals to meet community needs

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 -