

			A: Organizational Background & Cultural Responsiveness		B: Program
Organization Name	Service Area	Total Score	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Community Health & Wellness	94	33		14
San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Community Health & Wellness	66	20	This proposal is well written however, it does not align with the service area Community Health and Wellness and it fits more squarely with disaster preparedness.	7
San Francisco Public Health Foundation	Community Health & Wellness	93	32	SFPHF has a strong track record since 1988 in bridging funding and administrative gaps for SFDPH and community partners. Their role as a fiscal intermediary with over \$20M managed demonstrates reliability and capacity. They provided strong examples (COVID-19 response in VVSD and CLI-funded preparedness planning), and their staff bring significant financial, compliance, and programmatic expertise. While the proposal emphasizes cultural inclusion in hiring and program administration, their direct service delivery role is limited—they mainly enable CBOs/FBOs to lead. This slightly reduces the direct demonstration of lived-experience-led engagement	13

	C: Deliverab		D: Detailed		E: Outreach
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
	13		10		9
The proposal is not aligned with the service area priorities.	11	The work plan is comprehensive yet it's difficult to see how the outputs align with the RFP.	8		8
The proposal clearly articulates purpose, objectives, and intended impact—implementing community-led public health emergency preparedness in Visitacion Valley and Sunnydale. The two-year design includes a detailed multi-phase timeline with community trainings, drills, and culturally grounded outreach. The strategy leverages existing plans co-created with residents. A minor gap is that the implementation relies heavily on partner execution; SFPHF itself is mainly administrative, which may limit adaptability if partner capacity varies	15	The proposal provides a comprehensive list of measurable outputs (e.g., 8 trainings, 100+ residents trained in CPR/First Aid in year 1; full-scale community drill and 200 residents registered for alerts by year 2). Roles and responsibilities across SFPHF, SFDPH PHEPR, Civic Edge, and local CBOs are very clearly defined. Risk mitigation strategies (redundancy in communications, multilingual outreach, feedback loops) are robust and realistic	9	The \$865,194 budget allocates \$700,000 directly to community organizations, ensuring most funds flow to frontline implementers. Administrative and program oversight staffing costs (\$114,371.67) and indirect (10%) are justified for compliance and monitoring. The narrative emphasizes equity and cost-effectiveness. A slight weakness is the relatively high reliance on external subawards, which may make sustainability dependent on continued funding	10

F: Evaluation		G: Letters of	
Optional Rationale	Category Score	Optional Rationale	Category Score
	10		5 Points
	7	The evaluation and reporting section is strong but lacks some details.	5 Points
Outreach is strongly grounded in multilingual, culturally resonant strategies (Spanish, Chinese, Tagalog, Vietnamese) and will be delivered by trusted neighborhood-based organizations. The proposal emphasizes accessibility (ADA-compliant, translation, in-person engagement at local hubs). Their layered approach—printed, digital, and in-person outreach—demonstrates thorough planning and responsiveness to the diversity of VVSD	9	The evaluation plan includes both quantitative (attendance, alerts registration, survey data) and qualitative (focus groups, interviews, feedback loops) methods. Quarterly reporting and public-facing briefs show accountability. A new Data Analyst role strengthens infrastructure. The only limitation is that much of the evaluation depends on partner organizations consistently collecting quality data, which can introduce variability	5 Points