

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 whom 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 
Committee Member

Date 04-11-2017

Witness 

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

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

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 25

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

E. Dimant
Signature of Evaluator

4-11-17
Date

Elyse Dimant
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 for 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
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

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

10 Points Maximum

10

TOTAL 85

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

Diamanti
Signature of Evaluator

4-11-17
Date

Erjete Diamanti
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: COPB - Parks & Recreation - 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.

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

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 75

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

D. D. D. D.

Signature of Evaluator

4-11-2017

Date

Enjeto D. D. D.

Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: COPB - Parks & Recreation - Youth Program

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

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 80

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

Diamondi 4-11-2017
Signature of Evaluator Date

Enjete Diamondi
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: Embracing Teal 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)

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

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 ~~30~~ 25

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

D. D. D. D.
Signature of Evaluator

4-11-2017
Date

Ejete D. D. D.
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

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?

0

TOTAL 100

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

[Signature]
Signature of Evaluator

4-11-2017
Date

[Signature]
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 **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 105

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

[Signature]
Signature of Evaluator

4-11-17
Date

[Signature]
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

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.

~~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

30 Points

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)

Maximum

~~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?

5

TOTAL 850

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

Did not meet minimum application
amount \$15,000.

Diamond 4-11-17
Signature of Evaluator Date

Erjete Diamond
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: Russell Life Skills

Amount of Funding Requested: \$28,500

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

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)

Maximum

~~20~~ 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 ~~80~~ 105

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

D. Dimausti 4-11-17
Signature of Evaluator Date

Enjeto Dimausti
Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: Second Chance

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

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)

Maximum

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 **110**

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

Diamanti
Signature of Evaluator

4-11-2017
Date

Enjelo Diamanti
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

30 Points

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)

Maximum

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 105

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

Diamondi

Signature of Evaluator

4-11-17

Date

Erjeto Diamondi

Print Name

RANKING / EVALUATION FORM

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

Name of Organization: Boys and Girls Club

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

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?

5

TOTAL 85

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

Dismanti 4-11-17
Signature of Evaluator Date

Enjoto Dismanti
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:

Diana Gutierrez

DATE:

4-11-2017