

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 16-17 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 Karen L. Sauter
Committee Member

Date 4/11/17

Witness

[Signature]

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 \$8,000 ACTIVITIES + SUPPLIES
10,892 SALARIES

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.

15

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

29%

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

15 SERVED

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)

28

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. NO

~~20~~ 20

(?)
ARE SALARIES
CONSIDERED ADMIN.
COSTS
20% MAXIMUM

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 ~~93~~ 93

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

INCREASE PROGRAM BY 4 WEEKS

NO MORE THAN 20% FOR ADMIN. COSTS(?)

OTHER SOURCE OF INCOME - 100% INKIND

NO L.O. SUPPORT

Karen Santen

Signature of Evaluator

4/4/17

Date

KAREN SANTEN

Print Name

(?)
PRIOR EXPEND?
KTTK

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: CENTER FOR IND. LIVING 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.

15

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points

26% - 49% - 15 points 30%

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)

50 SERVED

~~30~~ 28

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.

YES

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~~ 5

~~20~~

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum

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

5

TOTAL ~~68~~ 73

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

Karen L. Santa 4/6/17
Signature of Evaluator Date

KAREN SANTEN
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: COPB SENIOR

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.

0 ~~25~~ ~~28~~

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

105 SERVED

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 ~~25~~ ~~28~~

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.

~~15~~ 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

67%

20 Points Maximum

~~20~~ 20

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum

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

5

75

TOTAL

~~68~~ 75

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

Karen L. Santen 4/10/17

Signature of Evaluator

Date

KAREN SANTEN

Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: COPB - SUMMER PROG

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.

0

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

500 SERVED

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?

5

TOTAL

~~70~~ 75

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

Karen L. Santen 4/6/17

Signature of Evaluator

Date

KAREN SANTEN

Print Name



RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: EMDRACING 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

50 SERVED

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.

525

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?

5

TOTAL 85

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

IN KIND \$106,000

F.R. 2,000

CDBG 148,197

TOTAL 146,697(?)

Karen L. Santen 4/6/17
Signature of Evaluator Date

KAREN SANTEN
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: LEARNING FOR SUCCESS KAPOW

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

390 SERVED

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~~ 28

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.

26

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?

5

TOTAL 105

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

Karen L. Santen 4/6/17
Signature of Evaluator Date

KAREN SANTEN
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: LUZ DEL MUNDO

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

*100
230 SERVED*

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)

28

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.

15

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~~ 20

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum

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

10

TOTAL ~~75~~ 103

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

GOOD COLLABORATIONS
NO SUPPORT LETTER
GOOD GOALS + OUTCOMES

Karen L. Santen 4/6/17
Signature of Evaluator Date

KAREN SANTEN
Print Name

7. SPENDING

0

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: OASIS OF HOPE

Amount of Funding Requested: \$10,000 (\$15K minimum?)

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.

15

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

100 SERVED

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~~ 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.

~~15~~ 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

?

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum

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

7

TOTAL _____

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

GOOD OUTCOMES & EVALUATION

NO SUPPORT LETTERS

DIDNT MEET MINIMUM REQUEST

Karen L. Santa 4/11/17

Signature of Evaluator

Date

KAREN SANTEN

Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: RUSSEL LIFE SKILLS

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.

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

115 SERVED

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)

28

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 ~~(3)~~

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum

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

5

TOTAL 108

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

GOOD OUTCOMES & EVALUATION

Karen L. Santen 4/6/17
Signature of Evaluator Date

KAREN SANTEN
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: SECOND CHANCE SOCIETY

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

75 SERVED

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?

15

TOTAL 140

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

EVIDENCE OF INCREASED NEED
SUPPORT FROM OTHER SOURCES IS HIGH
EXCELLENT LETTERS OF SUPPORT

Karen L. Santen 4/7/17

Signature of Evaluator

Date

KAREN SANTEN

Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: WOMEN IN DISTRESS

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

99,000 (?)

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)

28

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.

NO ?

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~~ 20

Bonus Points

10 Points Maximum

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

5

TOTAL ~~92~~ 103

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

NO LETTERS OF SUPPORT (?)

Karen L. Santen 4/7/17
Signature of Evaluator Date

KAREN SANTEN
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: BOYS + GIRL CLUBS OF BROW. 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.

10

Percentage of budget funded with CDBG:

100% - 0 points

75% - 99% - 5 points

50% - 74% - 10 points 74%

26% - 49% - 15 points

25% or less - 30 points

Quality/Cost Effectiveness

868 SERVED

30 Points Maximum

30 28

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)

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.

15 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?

5

TOTAL

~~78~~ 83

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

NO LETTERS OF SUPPORT (?)

Karen L. Santen 4/4/17
Signature of Evaluator Date

KAREN SANTEN
Print Name

[illegible]

1		CHDO 15% SET A SIDE	AFFORDABLE HOUSING	\$ 39,170.55	\$ -	\$ -										Available funds \$117,171 PY 2015; 2016 & 2017
2		City of Pompano Beach	First Time Homebuyers	\$ 227,736.00	\$ -											
		City of Pompano Beach	HOME ADMINISTRATION (10%)	\$ 26,114.00	\$ 30,365.00											
			TOTAL REQUEST	\$ 293,020.55												
			2017-18 Allocation	\$ 261,137.00												
			CHDO 15%	\$ 39,170.55												
			ADM. 10%	\$ 26,113.70												
			EN TOTAL	\$ 227,736.00												

RFP EVALUATOR SIGNATURE:

Karen Sauter

DATE:

4/11/17