

## Small Grant Scoring Guidance

Small grants will be scored on a 100-point scale, earning points for criteria which are grouped into six categories.

1. Organizational commitments and capacity – 13 possible points
2. Project description and scope – 17 possible points
3. Environmental benefits – 19 possible points
4. Social benefits – 19 possible points
5. Workforce and contractor benefits – 19 possible points\*
6. Budget – 13 possible points

Within each category there are a number of criteria. Each criteria is can be awarded up to a certain number of possible points. These are indicated in the column labeled "Possible points".

\* Note that the possible points for the overall categories in the bullets above and the tables that follow do not apply to workforce and contractor support grant applications. Please review point allocation explanation for workforce and contractor support grants on page 80.

\*\* Projects that have a physical/capital infrastructure component can be awarded 19 possible points for criteria within the Workforce and Contractor Benefits category. If a project does not have a physical/capital infrastructure component (e.g., education/awareness programs) the weighting is adjusted so that this category has a total of 4 possible points based on the number of jobs supported by the grant (#FTE/grant \$). The remaining 15 points will be redistributed amongst other categories.

\*\*\* There are some criteria that do not apply to all project types. These are noted in the tables with explanations in footnotes. If a criteria does not apply to a project type it will not be included in the application score.

<b>Organizational commitments and capacity: 13 out of 100 possible points</b>				
Criteria	Possible points	Full point	Partial point	No points

Organization's purpose is to deliver programs that benefit economically disadvantaged community members, including people of color, women, people with disabilities, and/or the chronically underemployed.	2.4	Primary purpose of the applicant organization is to deliver programs that the benefit communities identified in this criteria. If the organization has a mission or statement of purpose, it must reflect that focus on delivering benefits to communities identified in this criteria.	Organization does deliver programs that benefit communities identified in this criteria, but it is not their primary purpose.	Organization's purpose does not align with criteria.
Organization is committed to racial and social justice, diversity, equity, inclusion and creating a positive working environment.	2.3	Application must demonstrate that racial and social justice are the principles guiding decision making, planning and work of the organization. The organization can demonstrate that commitment through work to address and correct historic discrimination. The organization articulates an understanding of the intersectional identities of the population(s) they serve. Trainings and educational opportunities related to justice, equity, diversity and inclusion that are offered or required for staff and/or board may also be used to demonstrate commitment but alone will not receive full points. Documentation may be provided but is not expected and will not be viewed as more valuable than description of values and/or work.	Organization has defined justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion as a priority and made some progress at operationalizing these principles within the organization. Examples might include staff and/or board trainings that are offered and/or required. Planning documents or decisions that are guided by justice principles.	No evidence provided of commitment to racial and social justice, diversity, equity and inclusion within organization.

Organization demonstrates strong understanding and practice around community engagement, particularly focused on historically marginalized and culturally diverse communities.	2.2	Engagement practices clearly informed by principles of inclusion, co-creation, and collaboration, and reflect an understanding of the community the organization serves.	Focus of engagement is more on outreach and updates and not well informed by principles of inclusion, co-creation, and collaboration.	No evidence that organization understands or practices inclusive engagement.
Staff (including leadership) and board of the organization reflect the community their proposed project is intended to benefit.	2.4	Majority of staff (including staff leadership) and a majority of the board of directors must reflect the community the project is intended to serve.	At least thirty percent of staff (including staff leadership) and thirty percent of board members reflect the community the project is intended to serve.	No representation of the community the project is intended to serve in staff or board.
Application demonstrates organization ability to manage funds responsibly and effectively.	2.1	Applicant organization must have a balanced budget, even if resilience is weak (e.g., few if any reserves, lack of contingency plan, lack of funding diversity). Organization must also have more than one person (staff and/or board) with financial controls and budget management responsibilities.	Budget may be imbalanced but financial position is improving and reason for recent-year deficit makes sense. At least one staff (paid) or board member (volunteer or paid) is responsible for budget management and financial reporting.	Description of budget management and financial controls is unclear or incomplete. Budget is not balanced and no evidence of improvement or reasonable explanation of deficits.

Ability to successfully manage grant.	1.6	Organization and/or staff have experience implementing grants or projects of a similar size, <u>managing</u> some component of work with responsibility for tracking budget and deliverables for that component. Application also provides reasonable plan for managing proposed grant including defining areas of responsibility, project communications management, and methods to ensure deliverables are met on time and within project budget.	Organization and/or staff on project have worked on successful grant funded projects, <u>assisting</u> with component of work related to tracking budget, reporting and/or deliverables for portions of project. Application includes a reasonable plan to manage grant including defining areas of responsibility, project communications management, and methods to ensure deliverables are met on time and within project budget.	Application provides no evidence that the applicant organization has the capacity to successfully manage the grant.
---------------------------------------	-----	---	--	---

Project Description and Scope: 17 out of 100 possible points				
Criteria	Possible points	Full points	Partial points	No points
Project description is complete and intended outcomes are clear.	2.4	It is clear from the project description what the applicant intends to do, why, who the intended beneficiaries are, and intended outcomes.	Some questions remain.	Incomplete, intended outcomes are not clear.

Services and activities described in scope will realistically result in intended outcomes.	3.6	Project services and activities must have a strong likelihood to result in stated intended outcomes.	Probable that services and activities will result in intended outcomes.	Services and activities are not likely to result in stated intended outcomes.
<sup>3</sup> Well described and appropriate plan to maintain project for its full lifecycle (beyond the life of grant).	0.9	Applicant must provide a well-developed plan to ensure benefits for the full lifecycle of the project (e.g., education and outreach, identifying staff and equipment needs, identifying sources of funding to pay for maintenance needs).	Applicant has thought through staff, equipment, and other needs to maintain the project for its full life cycle but has not clearly identified ways in which maintenance plan will be implemented.	Applicant does not provide any plan to maintain the project.
Project timeline is reasonable.	0.9	To receive full points the project timeline must be reasonable and include allowances for delays, both internal and external, that can be accommodated without impacting success of project.	Project timeline appears reasonable but does not accommodate delays, either internal or external caused.	Project timeline not reasonable and likely to create problems for the proposed project.
Plan for project communications is clear and effective.	0.9	Key stakeholders are identified and there is a clear description of the role communication will play in the project, strategies that will be employed, and how communication will be managed.	Stakeholders have been identified and the role of communication in the project is well understood.	No stakeholders or communication modes identified.

---

<sup>3</sup> This criteria only applies to projects that include physical improvements and/or infrastructure.

Project team (note that team includes non-profit staff, contractors, and other partners) have demonstrated experience executing similar projects.	5.1	Project team members that have been identified have experience successfully implementing projects that share common characteristics to the project for which they are applying. If applicable, application includes plan to secure additional project team members with appropriate experience.	Project team members that have been identified have worked on projects that, while they may not share common characteristics, have prepared them to be successful implementing the proposed project. If applicable, application includes plan to secure additional project team members with appropriate experience.	No experience.
Partnerships on project are meaningful and equitable.	1.7	Partnerships identified in the application must have clearly defined commitments to shared power, collaborative decision-making, accountability, and fair distribution of benefit. Partnership is defined broadly and includes collaboration between non-profit organizations, contractors and subcontractors, community groups, and others.	Partnerships identify commitment to shared power, collaborative decision-making, accountability, and fair distribution of benefit.	No consideration to shared power, collaborative decision-making, accountability, and fair distribution of benefit.
Application demonstrates community support.	1.7	Applicant must provide documentation and/or evidence of strong community support including MOUs, letters of	Applicant provides documentation and/or	No evidence of community support.

		support, Community Benefits Agreements, etc.	evidence of some community support.	
--	--	--	-------------------------------------	--

<b>Environmental Benefits: 19 out of 100 possible points</b>				
Criteria	Possible points	Full points	Partial points	No points
Indirect GHG reduction/sequestration	5.6	To receive full points the project must have a high likelihood of resulting in future or indirect GHG reduction.	Project may result in future and/or indirect GHG reduction.	Project will not result in future or indirect GHG reduction.
<sup>4</sup> Cost effectiveness of emissions reduction (CO <sub>2</sub> e/\$ total budget for project life)	7.7	This criteria is calculated for all applications based on total project budget and fuel displaced by project. Points awarded as follows: bottom 20% of applicants = 0 points, 21 to 40% = 1 point, 41 to 60% = 2 points, 61 to 80% = 3 points, 81 to 100% = 4 points. Methodology for CO <sub>2</sub> e reduction/sequestration will be defined for each type of project and applied consistently.		
Project provides additional non-GHG environmental benefits	5.7	This is a binary score: points awarded for non-GHG environmental benefits including habitat creation/protection, water management, replacement of grass w/native plants, etc.		

<b>Social Benefits: 19 out of 100 possible points</b>				
Criteria	Possible points	Full points	Middle points	No points

---

<sup>4</sup> This criteria only applies to projects that include physical improvements and/or infrastructure.

Project reduces and/or stabilizes cost for low income people and people of color.	5.1	Project provides cost savings and/or cost stabilization to household costs of low-income people and people of color (e.g., utility bills, transportation costs, food costs).	Project provides cost savings and/or cost stabilization for low income people either through savings to non-residential facilities owned or occupied by organizations that serve low income people or communities of color.	No evidence of cost savings or stabilization.
Project provides health benefits to PCEF priority populations.	4.6	Project provides meaningful health benefits specifically to PCEF priority populations (e.g. improved indoor air quality, access to low cost/high quality food, etc.).	Health benefits and beneficiary populations noted are general in nature, (e.g. project reduces carbon, tree cover in space not specific to beneficiary, etc.)	No health benefits.
Project and/or project participants are located east of 82nd Avenue or in census tracts with at least 50% households at or below 200% federal poverty level. If the project includes workforce and contractor development, participants are from PCEF priority population(s).	4.4	All project benefits go to people who live in the target area(s) or, if the project includes infrastructure, it is located in target area(s). If the project includes workforce and contractor development, participants are from PCEF priority population(s).	At least half of the benefits of the project will go to people who reside in the target area(s). If the project includes workforce and contractor development, half of participants are from PCEF priority population(s).	None of the project beneficiaries and/or project sites are located in target area(s), or are from PCEF priority population.



Project improves resiliency by 1) addressing the harm to frontline communities caused by climate change, and/or 2) improving ability to withstand and adapt to existing and future climate impacts, and/or 3) protects workers on PCEF projects from exposure to climate related vulnerabilities	5.0	Project addresses current or future vulnerabilities to harm specific to PCEF priority population(s) that are caused by climate change. Impacts of climate change include poor air quality resulting from wildfire, urban heat islands, vector born illness, and others. The resiliency measures must be designed to reduce the identified current or future harm. The application must also, if applicable, identify related potential harm to workers on the proposed project and have a plan to mitigate that harm.	Project has identified general vulnerabilities to impacts of climate change and the proposed project employs general measures to address.	Project does not improve resiliency.
--	-----	---	---	--------------------------------------

The following two tables will be used to score grant applications that include physical/capital projects. If a project does not have a physical/capital infrastructure component (e.g. education/awareness programs) the weighting is adjusted so that this category has a total of 4 possible points based on the number of jobs supported by the grant (#FTE/grant \$).

- [Table W.1](#) – Grant applications that include physical/capital projects AND have a total budget for contracts that does not exceed \$20,000.
- [Table W.2](#) – Grant applications that include physical/capital projects AND have a total budget for contracts that exceeds \$20,000.

<b>Workforce and contractor benefits Table W.1: 19 out of 100 possible points</b>				
This is the scoring table for applications that include a physical/capital project AND have no more than \$20,000 budgeted for contracting.				
Criteria	Possible points	Full points	Partial points	No points

Grant funded job hours (#FTE/\$ invested).	4.0	Top 20% of all applications received.	Middle 20% of applications received.	Lowest 20% percent of applications received.
Strategy and commitments for recruitment, retention, and advancement of diverse local workers, including apprentices.	4.9	Applicant has a strong strategy and commitments for hiring, retaining, and advancing diverse local workers and apprentices on this project.	Applicant has strong strategy for recruitment and utilization of diverse local workers and apprentices on the project.	Weak or no recruitment strategy and utilization commitments.
Project prioritizes payment of prevailing wages to workers in trades for which a prevailing wage is defined.	4.9	For full points, applicant pays or requires contractors and subcontractors on the project to pay prevailing wages and benefits to employees in trades for which prevailing wages are defined.	Project prioritizes contractors and subcontractors that provide prevailing wages and/or benefits for employees.	No priority.
Project prioritizes provision of benefits to workers not receiving prevailing wage.	5.3	Pays or requires contractors and subcontractors to pay health insurance, paid time off, and retirement contributions.	Pays or require contractors and subcontractors to pay health insurance.	No requirements.

**Workforce and contractor benefits Table W.2: 19 out of 100 possible points**

This is the scoring table for an application that includes a physical/capital project AND has a total contracting budget of more than \$20,000

Criteria	Possible points	Full points	Middle points	No points
----------	-----------------	-------------	---------------	-----------

Grant funded job hours (#FTE/\$ invested).	3.1	Top 20% of all applications received.	Middle 20% of applications received.	Lowest 20% percent of applications received.
Strategy and commitments for recruitment and utilization of diverse local contractors and subcontractors.	4.3	Have secured diverse local contractor(s) and, if applicable, have commitments from contractors to recruit and utilize diverse local subcontractors.	Reasonable strategy to recruit and utilize diverse local contractors and subcontractors.	No strategy to recruit and utilize diverse local contractors and subcontractors.
Strategy and commitments for recruitment, retention, and advancement of diverse local workers, including apprentices.	3.8	Applicant has a strong strategy and commitments for hiring, retaining, and advancing diverse local workers and apprentices on this project.	Applicant has strong strategy for recruitment and utilization of diverse local workers and apprentices on the project.	Weak or no recruitment strategy and utilization commitments.
Project prioritizes payment of prevailing wages to workers in trades for which a prevailing wage is defined.	3.8	For full points, applicant pays or requires contractors and subcontractors on the project to pay prevailing wages and benefits to employees in trades for which prevailing wages are defined.	Project prioritizes contractors and subcontractors that provide prevailing wages and/or benefits for employees.	No priority.
Project prioritizes provision of benefits to workers not receiving prevailing wage.	4.1	Pays or requires contractors and subcontractors to pay health insurance, paid time off, and retirement contributions.	Pays or require contractors and subcontractors to pay health insurance.	No requirements.

<b>Budget: 13 out of 100 possible points</b>				
Criteria	Possible points	Full points	Partial points	No points
Project budget complete and reasonable.	7.8	To receive full points the budget must be complete, clear, and appropriately scaled to the proposed project.	Budget is not complete and/or is not appropriate to the proposed project (e.g., too large, too small, missing key items, including extraneous items).	Budget is complete but would benefit from modification /right sizing to the proposed project.
Project leverage.	5.2	Projects with no leverage = 0 points, 5% = 1 point, 10% = 2 points, 15% = 3 points, 20% = 4 points. Leveraged contribution does not have to be secured at time of application. Funds can come from any non-PCEF source (e.g. other grants, donors, etc.). Leverage contribution can be cash or in-kind. Eligible in-kind contributions include labor, use of equipment necessary for project, others considered on case by case basis.		