

City of Pompano Beach
CDBG/HOME RFP Scoring Committee Member
FY 2017-2018 Conflict of Interest Acknowledgement

The City of Pompano Beach is an entitlement community administered by the City's Office of Housing and Urban Improvement that administers HUD Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and Home Investment Partnerships Program (HOME) funds. HUD regulations and the City of Pompano Beach do not allow persons who participate in the decision-making process or gain inside information regarding these programs to obtain a financial interest or benefit from them. Therefore, it is necessary for you to acknowledge the following:

Conflicts Prohibited. I will not obtain a financial interest or benefit from the City of Pompano Beach CDBG or HOME Programs in any contract, subcontract, or agreement with respect to the Programs, or with respect to any proceeds of the Programs, either for myself or those with who I have business or immediate family ties during my tenure on the City of Pompano Beach FY 17-18 RFP Scoring Committee or for one year thereafter.

Persons Covered. I understand that this conflict of interest restriction also applies to me as an employee, agent, consultant, officer, or elected official or appointed official of a City of Pompano Beach CDBG or HOME Program recipient, or of any designated public agencies, or of persons receiving such funds.

Exceptions. Upon the written request of the recipient of a prohibited financial interest or benefit as described above, HUD may grant an exception on a case-by-case basis when it has satisfactorily met the threshold requirements below, taking into account their cumulative effects. HUD will consider an exception only after the recipient has provided the following documentation:

- a) A disclosure of the nature of the conflict, accompanied by an assurance that has been public disclosure of the conflict and a description of how the public disclosure was made; and
- b) An opinion of the recipient's attorney that the interest for which the exception is sought would not violate State or local law.

In determining whether to grant a requested CDBG conflict exception, HUD will take into account the cumulative effect of the following factors, as applicable:

- a) Whether the exception would provide a significant cost benefit or an essential degree of expertise to the program or project that would otherwise not be available;
- b) Whether an opportunity was provided for open competitive bidding or negotiation;
- c) Whether the person affected is a member of a group or class of low- or moderate-income persons intended to be the beneficiaries of the assisted activity, and the exception will permit such person to receive generally the same interests or benefits as are being made available or provided to the group or class;
- d) Whether the affected person has withdrawn from his or her functions or responsibilities, or the decision-making process with respect to the specific assisted activity in question;
- e) Whether the interest or benefit was present before the affected person was in a position as described in the first paragraph of this acknowledgement.
- f) Whether undue hardship will result either to the recipient or the person affected when weighed against the public interest served by avoiding the prohibited conflict; and
- g) Any other relevant considerations.

Similar and additional factors apply in considering factors for exceptions in the case of HOME conflicts:

- (1) Whether the exception would provide a significant cost benefit or an essential degree of expertise to the program or project which would otherwise not be available;
- (2) Whether the person affected is a member of a group or class of low-income persons intended to be the beneficiaries of the assisted activity, and the exception will permit such person to receive generally the same interests or benefits as are being made available or provided to the group or class;

(3) Whether the affected person has withdrawn from his or her functions or responsibilities, or the decision making process with respect to the specific assisted activity in question;

(4) Whether the interest or benefit was present before the affected person was in a position as described in paragraph (c) of this section;

(5) Whether undue hardship will result either to the participating jurisdiction or the person affected when weighed against the public interest served by avoiding the prohibited conflict.

(6) Any other relevant considerations.

(f) *Owners and Developers.* (1) No owner, developer or sponsor of a project assisted with HOME funds (or officer, employee, agent, elected or appointed official or consultant of the owner, developer or sponsor) whether private, for profit or non-profit (including a community housing development organization (CHDO) when acting as an owner, developer or sponsor) may occupy a HOME-assisted affordable housing unit in a project. This provision does not apply to an individual who receives HOME funds to acquire or rehabilitate his or her principal residence or to an employee or agent of the owner or developer of a rental housing project who occupies a housing unit as the project manager or maintenance worker.

(2) *Exceptions.* Upon written request of a housing owner or developer, the participating jurisdiction (or State recipient, if authorized by the State participating jurisdiction) may grant an exception to the provisions of paragraph (f)(1) of this section on a case-by-case basis when it determines that the exception will serve to further the purposes of the HOME program and the effective and efficient administration of the owner's or developer's HOME-assisted project. In determining whether to grant a requested exception, the participating jurisdiction shall consider the following factors:

(i) Whether the person receiving the benefit is a member of a group or class of low-income persons intended to be the beneficiaries of the assisted housing, and the exception will permit such person to receive generally the same interests or benefits as are being made available or provided to the group or class;

(ii) Whether the person has withdrawn from his or her functions or responsibilities, or the decision making process with respect to the specific assisted housing in question;

(iii) Whether the tenant protection requirements of § 92.253 are being observed;

(iv) Whether the affirmative marketing requirements of § 92.351 are being observed and followed; and

(v) Any other factor relevant to the participating jurisdiction's determination, including the timing of the requested exception.

Acknowledged

Norely Sauls-Meyreth
Committee Member

Date

April 11, 2017

Witness

Rora Y. Daise

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Boys & Girls Clubs of Broward County

Amount of Funding Requested: \$72,000

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

30

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

30

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

20 Points Maximum

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

20

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum


Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?

TOTAL 100

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

Funding request represents less than 1% of budget.

100% utilization of prior year's funding.



Beverly Sanders-Mayweather
Signature of Evaluator

4-11-17
Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Parks & Recreation and Cultural Arts Senior Program

Amount of Funding Requested: \$109,600

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

30

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% – 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% – 49% - 15 points

25% or less – 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

30

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

20 Points Maximum

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

10

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum


Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?

0

TOTAL 90

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

Prior spending experience less than 75%


 Beverly Sanders-Mayweather 4-11-17
 Signature of Evaluator Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather
 Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Learning for Success

Amount of Funding Requested: \$15,000

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

30

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

30

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

20 Points Maximum

20

Bonus Points

Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?


10 Points Maximum

10

TOTAL ~~90~~ 110 ^{BTS}

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

Serve 390 low income students at Crystal Lake Middle,
Pompano Beach, Cypress Run Education Center by
implementing the Kids and the Power of Work Program.
Employability Skills Training Program.


 Beverly Sanders-Mayweather 4-11-17
 Signature of Evaluator Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather
 Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Russell Education Foundation

Amount of Funding Requested: \$28,850

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

10

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

30

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

20 Points Maximum

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

10

Bonus Points


10 Points Maximum

Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?

TOTAL ~~60~~ 70^{BAS}

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

CDBG grant represents 57% of total program funding. Prior
year utilization is 25% of allocation. (\$3,375 drawn
down out of \$13,500.



Beverly Sanders-Mayweather 4-11-17
 Signature of Evaluator Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather
 Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Broward Children's Center

Amount of Funding Requested: \$18,892.00

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

30

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

30

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

20 Points Maximum

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

0

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum


Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?

10

TOTAL 90

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

Funding request is less than 1% of budget. Prior
year utilization is zero, funding was \$12,080.



Beverly Sanders-Mayweather 4-11-17

Signature of Evaluator

Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather

Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Parks & Recreation and Cultural Arts Youth

Amount of Funding Requested: \$50,000

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

30

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

30

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

20 Points Maximum

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

10

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum

Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?

TOTAL 90

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

Summer Programming. Funding expected to be
expended in the Summer 2017.



Beverly Sanders-Mayweather 4-11-17

Signature of Evaluator

Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather

Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Luz Del Mundo - Light of the World Clinic, Inc.

Amount of Funding Requested: \$18,055

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

30

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

30

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

20 Points Maximum

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

15

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum


Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?

10

TOTAL 105

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

Funding for Community Outreach, Education, and
Healthcare Services to benefit 350 economically
disadvantaged, residents.



Beverly Sanders-Mayweather 4-11-17

Signature of Evaluator

Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather

Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Second Chance Society, Inc.

Amount of Funding Requested: \$15,000

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

30

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

30

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

20 Points Maximum

20

Bonus Points

Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?


10 Points Maximum

10

TOTAL ~~90~~ 110^{BS}

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

Funding request is 5% of current budget. Program serves a unique and hard to reach target population.


 Beverly Sanders-Mayweather 4-11-17
 Signature of Evaluator Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather
 Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Center for Independent Living of Broward

Amount of Funding Requested: \$17,762

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

30

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

30

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

20 Points Maximum

5

Bonus Points


10 Points Maximum

Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?

TOTAL 80 85 ^{BIB}

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

Funding to provide housing counseling, and consumer workshops, Assisted Technology, and Case Management resources for residents with disabilities.



Signature of Evaluator Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Embracing Team, Inc.

Amount of Funding Requested: \$148,197

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

10

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

25

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

20 Points Maximum

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

20

Bonus Points


10 Points Maximum

Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?

TOTAL 55 75 BBS

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

Funding increase of 188% over last year. Funding to
provide pathways to College Readiness for 50 low to
moderate income persons through cutting edge
technology, software applications in real world application.


 Beverly Sanders-Mayweather 4-11-17
 Signature of Evaluator Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather
 Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Oasis of Hope Community Development Center, Inc.

Amount of Funding Requested: \$10,000

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

30

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

15

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

10

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

Office of Housing and Urban Improvement
Request for Proposals for CDBG & HOME Funding

Name of Organization: Women In Distress of Broward County, Inc.

Amount of Funding Requested: \$30,000

FOR CDBG ACTIVITIES

The City will score applications based on a weighted scale of 110 points and the following criteria:

Local Support/Leveraging:

30 Points Maximum

Ability to leverage CDBG funds through matching funding sources from other agencies, grants, private funds or infusion of the organizations own funds evidenced.

30

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

30 Points Maximum

Design of the program provides maximum benefit for clients to be served. Program or enhancements that do not duplicate an existing service/program/activity. Activities that provide a new or quantifiable increase in a general service program, transportation services, and substance abuse services, employment training, youth programs, the elderly, etc. (low/mod or limited clientele benefit)

30

Experience/Community Support

20 Points Maximum

Ability to manage the project if funded; areas to consider are staff capabilities, other available resources, organizations years of experience, leadership, management history and support letters from community.

20

Prior Spending Experience

20 Points Maximum

- Expended 100% of funds awarded – 20 points
- Expended 75% of funds awarded – 15 points
- Expended funds in a timely manner – 10 points
- Did not spend funds in time awarded – 0 points
- First Time Applicant – No project in last fiscal year – 5 points

20

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum


Uniqueness of project – are there other programs available to the community similar to this project?

10

TOTAL 90 ^{BAS} 110

List the reason for this evaluation (justify the rating/scoring)

Funding request is less than 1% of current budget. Program serves a unique target population.


 Beverly Sanders-Mayweather 4-11-17
 Signature of Evaluator Date

Beverly Sanders-Mayweather
 Print Name