City of Alameda CDBG FY 15-16 Application Evaluations ATTACHMENT B

Total possible score is 100 with an opportunity to obtain 10 additional bonus points.*

Alameda Food Bank

Guide	Related App. Question	Criteria	Max	Doug Biggs	Nicole Blake	Audrey Hyman	Michael Radding	Mark Sorensen	Henry Villareal	Jennifer Williams	TOTAL SCORE
A.	**Project Description (Max 70 pts.)**										
1.	Q1	Proposal addresses the priority as stated by the Social Services and Human Relations Board and has adequately documented how need was determined	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	34
2.	Q2	Proposal has clearly defined, measurable client outcomes	5	4	5	5	3	5	5	5	32
3.	Q3	Scope of work is clearly defined and appropriate to achieving the stated outcomes	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	33
4.	Q4	Cost per client is appropriate to project scope and activities	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	33
5.	Q5	Program has appropriate income verification in place	5	5	3	5	5	4	3	5	30
6.	Q6	Proposal identifies other agencies providing similar service and/or delineates the uniqueness of the program	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
7.	Q7	Proposal delineates engagement strategy, including outreach to diverse and underserved populations, and to Alameda residents	5	5	3	5	3	5	4	5	30
8.	Q8	Timeline is realistic and demonstrates distribution of funds by end of fiscal year.*	10	10	10	10	7	8	15	10	70
9.	Q9	Program is requesting funds for less than 65% of total Program budget.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
10.	Q9	Program is requesting funds for less than 25% of total Program budget*	10	10	10	10	10	10	15	10	75
11.	Q.10	Proposal demonstrates the added value of this funding	10	10	8	10	8	10	10	10	66
C.	**Budget & funding (Max 15 pts.)**										
12.	Budget & Q9	Proposal identifies reasonable leveraged funding and funding commitments.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
13.	Budget	Proposal budget is clear and and reasonable.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
14.	Budget	Proposal provides explanation and justification of all related program costs.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
D.	**Capacity (Max 15 pts.)**										
15.	Q11	Proposal identifies staff expertise to carry out activity.	5	5	3	5	4	5	5	5	32
16.	Q11	Proposal reflects the cultural competency of program staff to address the needs of the target population.	5	3	3	5	5	5	3	5	29
17.	Q11	Organization has the capacity to meet the City's administrative requirements and proposed outcomes; and if applicable, has satisfactorily met them in the past.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
		Final Score:		**96**	**90**	**100**	**89**	**95**	**104**	**100**	**674**

	Doug Biggs	Nicole Blake	Audrey Hyman	Michael Radding	Mark Sorensen	Henry Villareal	Jennifer Williams	TOTAL SCORE
Alameda Food Bank								

City of Alameda CDBG FY 15-16 Application Evaluations

Total possible score is 100 with an opportunity to obtain 10 additional bonus points.*

Building Futures for Women and Children

Guide	Related App. Question	Criteria	Max	Doug Biggs	Nicole Blake	Audrey Hyman	Michael Radding	Mark Sorensen	Henry Villareal	Jennifer Williams	TOTAL SCORE
A.	**Project Description (Max 70 pts.)**										
1.	Q1	Proposal addresses the priority as stated by the Social Services and Human Relations Board and has adequately documented how need was determined	5	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	32
2.	Q2	Proposal has clearly defined, measurable client outcomes	5	3	5	5	3	4	5	5	30
3.	Q3	Scope of work is clearly defined and appropriate to achieving the stated outcomes	5	2	5	5	5	5	5	5	32
4.	Q4	Cost per client is appropriate to project scope and activities	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	33
5.	Q5	Program has appropriate income verification in place	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
6.	Q6	Proposal identifies other agencies providing similar service and/or delineates the uniqueness of the program	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	34
7.	Q7	Proposal delineates engagement strategy, including outreach to diverse and underserved populations, and to Alameda residents	5	4	3	5	5	5	5	5	32
8.	Q8	Timeline is realistic and demonstrates distribution of funds by end of fiscal year.*	10	7	8	10	5	9	15	10	64
9.	Q9	Program is requesting funds for less than 65% of total Program budget.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
10.	Q9	Program is requesting funds for less than 25% of total Program budget*	10	10	10	10	10	10	15	10	75
11.	Q.10	Proposal demonstrates the added value of this funding	10	8	10	10	7	9	10	10	64
C.	**Budget & funding (Max 15 pts.)**										
12.	Budget & Q9	Proposal identifies reasonable leveraged funding and funding commitments.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
13.	Budget	Proposal budget is clear and and reasonable.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
14.	Budget	Proposal provides explanation and justification of all related program costs.	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	33
D.	**Capacity (Max 15 pts.)**										
15.	Q11	Proposal identifies staff expertise to carry out activity.	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	34
16.	Q11	Proposal reflects the cultural competency of program staff to address the needs of the target population.	5	5	4	5	5	5	4	5	33
17.	Q11	Organization has the capacity to meet the City's administrative requirements and proposed outcomes; and if applicable, has satisfactorily met them in the past.	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5	33
		Final Score:		**85**	**93**	**100**	**88**	**96**	**107**	**100**	**669**

	Doug Biggs	Nicole Blake	Audrey Hyman	Michael Radding	Mark Sorensen	Henry Villareal	Jennifer Williams	TOTAL SCORE
Building Futures for Women and Children								

City of Alameda CDBG FY 15-16 Application Evaluations

Total possible score is 100 with an opportunity to obtain 10 additional bonus points.*

Family Violence Law Center

Guide	Related App. Question	Criteria	Max	Doug Biggs	Nicole Blake	Audrey Hyman	Michael Radding	Mark Sorensen	Henry Villareal	Jennifer Williams	TOTAL SCORE
A.	**Project Description (Max 70 pts.)**										
1.	Q1	Proposal addresses the priority as stated by the Social Services and Human Relations Board and has adequately documented how need was determined	5	4	5	5	4	3	5	5	31
2.	Q2	Proposal has clearly defined, measurable client outcomes	5	5	5	3	3	4	4	3	27
3.	Q3	Scope of work is clearly defined and appropriate to achieving the stated outcomes	5	4	5	3	5	5	4	5	31
4.	Q4	Cost per client is appropriate to project scope and activities	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	34
5.	Q5	Program has appropriate income verification in place	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	32
6.	Q6	Proposal identifies other agencies providing similar service and/or delineates the uniqueness of the program	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	34
7.	Q7	Proposal delineates engagement strategy, including outreach to diverse and underserved populations, and to Alameda residents	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	34
8.	Q8	Timeline is realistic and demonstrates distribution of funds by end of fiscal year.*	10	10	10	10	5	9	7	10	61
9.	Q9	Program is requesting funds for less than 65% of total Program budget.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
10.	Q9	Program is requesting funds for less than 25% of total Program budget*	10	10	10	10	10	10	15	10	75
11.	Q.10	Proposal demonstrates the added value of this funding	10	10	10	5	7	8	8	10	58
C.	**Budget & funding (Max 15 pts.)**										
12.	Budget & Q9	Proposal identifies reasonable leveraged funding and funding commitments.	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	34
13.	Budget	Proposal budget is clear and and reasonable.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
14.	Budget	Proposal provides explanation and justification of all related program costs.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
D.	**Capacity (Max 15 pts.)**										
15.	Q11	Proposal identifies staff expertise to carry out activity.	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	34
16.	Q11	Proposal reflects the cultural competency of program staff to address the needs of the target population.	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	33
17.	Q11	Organization has the capacity to meet the City's administrative requirements and proposed outcomes; and if applicable, has satisfactorily met them in the past.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
		Final Score:		**98**	**98**	**91**	**88**	**91**	**94**	**98**	**658**

	Doug Biggs	Nicole Blake	Audrey Hyman	Michael Radding	Mark Sorensen	Henry Villareal	Jennifer Williams	TOTAL SCORE
Family Violence Law Center								

City of Alameda CDBG FY 15-16 Application Evaluations

Total possible score is 100 with an opportunity to obtain 10 additional bonus points.*

Legal Assitance and Education for Alameda Seniors

Guide	Related App. Question	Criteria	Max	Doug Biggs	Nicole Blake	Audrey Hyman	Michael Radding	Mark Sorensen	Henry Villareal	Jennifer Williams	TOTAL SCORE
A.	**Project Description (Max 70 pts.)**										
1.	Q1	Proposal addresses the priority as stated by the Social Services and Human Relations Board and has adequately documented how need was determined	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	34
2.	Q2	Proposal has clearly defined, measurable client outcomes	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	33
3.	Q3	Scope of work is clearly defined and appropriate to achieving the stated outcomes	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	5	33
4.	Q4	Cost per client is appropriate to project scope and activities	5	4	4	5	5	4	4	5	31
5.	Q5	Program has appropriate income verification in place	5	5	3	5	5	4	2	5	29
6.	Q6	Proposal identifies other agencies providing similar service and/or delineates the uniqueness of the program	5	4	4	5	5	4	5	5	32
7.	Q7	Proposal delineates engagement strategy, including outreach to diverse and underserved populations, and to Alameda residents	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
8.	Q8	Timeline is realistic and demonstrates distribution of funds by end of fiscal year.*	10	6	9	10	7	8	15	10	65
9.	Q9	Program is requesting funds for less than 65% of total Program budget.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
10.	Q9	Program is requesting funds for less than 25% of total Program budget*	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	70
11.	Q.10	Proposal demonstrates the added value of this funding	10	7	10	10	10	8	7	10	62
C.	**Budget & funding (Max 15 pts.)**										
12.	Budget & Q9	Proposal identifies reasonable leveraged funding and funding commitments.	5	3	5	5	5	4	4	5	31
13.	Budget	Proposal budget is clear and and reasonable.	5	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	32
14.	Budget	Proposal provides explanation and justification of all related program costs.	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	34
D.	**Capacity (Max 15 pts.)**										
15.	Q11	Proposal identifies staff expertise to carry out activity.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
16.	Q11	Proposal reflects the cultural competency of program staff to address the needs of the target population.	5	5	4	5	3	5	5	5	32
17.	Q11	Organization has the capacity to meet the City's administrative requirements and proposed outcomes; and if applicable, has satisfactorily met them in the past.	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	35
		Final Score:		**85**	**94**	**100**	**94**	**91**	**94**	**100**	**658**

	Doug Biggs	Nicole Blake	Audrey Hyman	Michael Radding	Mark Sorensen	Henry Villareal	Jennifer Williams	TOTAL SCORE
Legal Assitance and Education for Alameda Seniors								

City of Alameda CDBG FY 15-16 Application Evaluation Totals

APPLICANT RANKING								
	Doug Biggs	Nicole Blake	Audrey Hyman	Michael Radding	Mark Sorensen	Henry Villareal	Jennifer Williams	TOTAL SCORE
Alameda Food Bank	96	90	100	89	95	104	100	674
Building Futures with Women and Children	85	93	100	88	96	107	100	669
Family Violence Law Center	98	98	91	88	91	94	98	658
Legal Assistance for Seniors	85	94	100	94	91	94	100	658
	Doug Biggs	Nicole Blake	Audrey Hyman	Michael Radding	Mark Sorensen	Henry Villareal	Jennifer Williams	TOTAL SCORE