

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

12

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 = 2:02 / 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]

N/A
(no FS)

N/A
(no private property involved)

Missing Submittal Requirements
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
1 or 1 2 3 4 (if FS)
1
1
N/A

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

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: URBAN TITH

Project Name: CULTIVATING HOPE

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:

- Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
- ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:
 0 = inadequate 1 = weak 2 = average 3 = strong

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)

Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist

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

3
3
3

*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

4
5
5
5
4
3

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

4
5

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

5
4

Financially Sound (20 points max)

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

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

4
4
5
5

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

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts) 15
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

86

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

9

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**

12

APPLICANT ORGANIZATION:
FISCAL SPONSOR (FS):
APPLICATION FOR FUNDING:

CURME (LOTS OF CROPS)
GRIP
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, above average amount of staff time/effort required, etc.)

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

N/A
(no FS)

N/A
(no private property involved)

Missing Submittal Requirements
1
1
1
1
1
1
1
1 or 1 2 3 4 (if FS)
1
1
N/A

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

REVIEWER NAME: *DEMIAN HADMAN & 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: CURME

Project Name: LOTS OF CROPS

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:

- Only eligible completed Funding Requests (Applications, Proposals and supporting documentation) submitted in accordance with the requirements specified in the official Guidelines should be evaluated and rated.
- ATTACH APPLICABLE ELIGIBILITY CHECKLIST TO EVALUATING/RATING PROPOSAL.

Evaluation Criteria (applicable Proposal Section or required attachment is noted for most items)

Rate how the Proposal addresses the items listed below using the following scoring system:
 0 = inadequate 1 = weak 2 = average 3 = strong

Organizational Capacity (9 points max)

Evidence that Organization/Fiscal Sponsor(s) in good standing with prior funder(s) * – see Letter from Past Funder(s) -OR- NRMF Staff summary on their Eligibility Checklist

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

2
2
3

*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

5
4
3
5
4
3

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

4
5

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

2
4

Financially Sound (20 points max)

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

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

3
3
4
3

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). 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) 3
- iv. Clear measurable outcomes with sound evidence of success addressing identified problem(s) 2
- v. Proven track record of successfully implementing similar activities on-time and within budget 2
- vi. Address unmet needs related to illegal dumping 2
- vii. Supplement or enhance (e.g. increase the effectiveness/success) non-mitigation funded efforts 2

SUBTOTAL - Funding Priorities (add above amounts) 16

MAXIMUM FUNDING PRIORITY SCORE = 21 POINTS

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

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

GRAND TOTAL 75

MAXIMUM SCORE = 100 POINTS

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

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.

7