

## Large grant: Draft scoring guidance

Large 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 points	Partial points	No points

Organization has a stated mission and track record of delivering programs that benefit economically disadvantaged community members, including people of color, women, people with disabilities, and/or the chronically underemployed.	2.1	Applicant organization has at least three years of delivering programs that benefit communities identified in this criteria, an organizational focus on those populations, and a stated mission guiding this work.	Organization has at least three years of history of delivering programs that benefit communities identified in this criteria and may or may not identify benefits to priority populations in stated mission.	No history.
Organization has demonstrated commitment to racial and social justice, diversity, equity, inclusion and creating a positive working environment within their internal operations.	2.0	Application must demonstrate that racial and social justice, equity, diversity and inclusion have been identified as a priority and the organization has successfully integrated these principles into operations, decision making and planning. Documentation could include policies, procedures, planning docs, recruitment plan, training offered/required, surveys of staff, and description of practices.	Organization has defined racial and social justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion as a priority and has made some progress at operationalizing these principles within the organization.	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.	1.9	Engagement practices are clearly informed by principles of inclusion, co-creation, and collaboration, and reflect an understanding of the community the organization serves. Application should include plan or strategy that identifies target population, identification of	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.

		engagement methods best suited to target population, resources/strategies to address potential barriers (e.g., translation, childcare, etc.), and examples of successful engagement from past.		
Staff (including leadership) and board of the organization reflect the community their proposed project is intended to benefit.	2.1	To receive full points the 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 on staff or board of community the project is intended to serve.
Organization provides benefits to employees.	1.8	To receive full points organization must provide health insurance benefits AND other benefits including retirement, paid time off, other health benefits, family friendly practices, etc.	Health insurance benefits only.	No benefits provided.
Application demonstrates organization ability to manage funds responsibly and effectively.	1.8	Applicant organization shows: revenues not less than expenditures and no egregious audit findings in three years; strong internal budget management practices and financial controls; strong operating reserves and contingency plan. Clearly defined areas of authority over budget and finances within organization, more than one individual needed to disburse large funds, consistent financial reporting practices,	Budget is balanced, though resilience is weak (e.g., few if any reserves, lack of contingency plan, lack of funding diversity). Organization has more than one person (staff and/or board) with financial controls and budget management responsibilities.	Application provided no evidence of internal budget management and financial controls. Audit findings that were not addressed/remediated, no explanation

		strong board oversight. Documentation includes three years (if available) audited financials and current YTD financial documents.		provided for operating in a deficit.
History of successful grant execution.	1.3	Organization and/or current leadership must provide evidence of successful management of grants that are similar in size or larger than the proposed project.	Organization and/or staff on project have evidence of successful work on grant projects including management of at least some component of work with budget and deliverable-tracking responsibilities, direct work on the funded project and assistance with reporting but may not have managed full grant process.	No history with grants.

<b>Project Description and Scope: 17 out of 100 possible points</b>				
Criteria	Possible points	Full points	Partial points	No points
Project description is complete and intended outcomes are clear.	2.4	Project description clearly states what the applicant intends to do, why, who the intended beneficiaries are, and what outcomes are expected.	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>5</sup> Well described and appropriate plan to maintain project for its full lifecycle (beyond the life of grant).	0.9	Applicant has provided 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	Project timeline is reasonable and includes 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.
Application provides clear plan for managing communication with stakeholders and project participants/beneficiaries	0.9	Applicant has provided a well-developed plan, appropriate to size and type, which includes identification of stakeholders, participant/beneficiary groups, modes of communication, timeline with clear milestones and identification of role and	Basic plan includes identification of stakeholders, participant/beneficiary groups, at least one primary point of contact from	No plan.

---

<sup>5</sup> This criteria only applies to projects that include physical improvements and/or infrastructure.

		area of responsibility for all project staff (person or position) related to project communication.	applicant agency, and modes of communication.	
Project team including non-profit staff, contractors, and other partners have demonstrated experience executing similar projects.	5.1	Applicant organization has staff with experience executing projects like the one for which the applicant is seeking funds. If the team includes partners and/or contractors, the applicant has either secured, or provided a detailed plan to secure, team members who have successfully executed similar projects.	Not all project team members have been identified. Those that have been identified have experience successfully implementing projects that share some elements or common characteristics to the project for which they are applying.	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. Partnership is defined more narrowly than those receiving full points.	No consideration to shared power, collaborative decision-making, accountability, and fair distribution of benefit.
Application demonstrates community support.	1.7	Applicant has provided documentation and/or evidence of strong community support including MOUs, letters of	Applicant has provided documentation and/or evidence of some community support.	Application does not provide evidence of support.

		support, Community Benefits Agreements, etc.		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	3.6	Project has 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>6</sup> Materials and supplies are selected based on embedded carbon and other environmental and health impacts.	4.0	Applicant has documented how their choices about purchase and use of materials and supplies for the proposed project will be based on reducing embedded carbon, promoting environmental stewardship, and protecting the health of workers and others who will come into contact with the materials and supplies. Applicant has also demonstrated commitment through current operations including procurement policies that detail how carbon, health and other environmental impacts guide decisions.	Applicant has articulated a general commitment to making choices about materials/supplies procured based on environmental and health impact. Analysis performed to assess embedded carbon and other environmental impacts is high level.	No consideration of environmental or health impacts in material and supplies choices.

---

<sup>6</sup> This criteria only applies to projects that include physical improvements and/or infrastructure.

Operational choices driven by embedded carbon and other environmental and health impacts.	1.9	To receive full points the applicant must demonstrate strong commitment to making choices about operations that are based on an understanding of embedded carbon, health and environmental stewardship. Commitment can be demonstrated by policies and/or certifications that detail how carbon, health and other environmental impacts are considered (e.g., green purchase criteria, office recycling/composting /reusable, green fleet, etc.).	Applicant has articulated general commitment to making choices about operations based on environmental and health impact. Analysis performed to assess embedded carbon, health and other environmental impacts is high level.	No consideration of environmental and health impacts in operational choices.
<sup>7</sup> Cost effectiveness of emissions reduction (CO2e/\$ total budget for project life)	5.8	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 CO2e reduction/sequestration will be defined using methods outlined in <a href="#">Appendix F</a> for each type of project and applied consistently.		
Project provides additional non-GHG environmental benefits	3.7	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.		

Social Benefits: 19 out of 100 possible points				
Criteria	Possible points	Full points	Middle points	No points

<sup>7</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 communities of color.	4.2	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 and communities of color 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.	3.6	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).	3.4	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)(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)(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.	4.0	Project address 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.
Project avoids and mitigates displacement and/or provides restorative measures for population(s) impacted by displacement, with a focus on displacement resulting from gentrification pressures.	3.7	Applicant has demonstrated consideration of displacement <u>and</u> integrate mitigation and/or restoration measures into project plan (e.g., tenant rights advocacy, rent stability requirements, putting land into affordable housing trust status, etc.).	Applicant has considered displacement and committed to consulting with the community to identify potential mitigation and/or restoration efforts.	No consideration of displacement.

The following four 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 that have a total budget for contracts that does NOT exceed \$20,000 AND do not include a single-site using more than \$350,000 in PCEF funds.
- [Table W.2](#) – Grant applications that include physical/capital projects that have a total budget for contracts that exceeds \$20,000 AND does not include a single-site using more than \$350,000 in PCEF funds.
- [Table W.3](#) – Grant applications that include physical/capital projects that have a total budget for contracts that does NOT exceed \$20,000 AND includes a single-site using more than \$350,000 in PCEF funds.
- [Table W.4](#) – Grant applications that include physical/capital projects that have a total budget for contracts exceeds \$20,000 AND includes a single-site using more than \$350,000 in PCEF funds.

<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 \$20K budgeted for contracting AND do not include any single site using more than \$350K in PCEF funds				
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% 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	4.9	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	No priority.

prevailing wage is defined.			and/or benefits for employees.	
Project prioritizes provision of benefits to workers not receiving prevailing wage.	5.3	Applicant 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 only.	No requirements.

<b>Workforce and contractor benefits Table W.2: 19 out of 100 possible points</b>				
This is the scoring table for physical/capital project that includes a contract budget of more than \$20K AND does NOT include any single site construction that proposes to use more than \$350K in PCEF funds.				
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% 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	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	Weak or no recruitment strategy and utilization commitments.

diverse local workers, including apprentices.			apprentices on the project	
Project prioritizes payment of prevailing wages to workers in trades for which a prevailing wage is defined.	3.8	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	Applicant pays, or requires contractors and subcontractors on the project to pay, health insurance, paid time off, and retirement contributions.	Pays or require contractors and subcontractors to pay health insurance only.	No requirements.

**Workforce and contractor benefits Table W.3: 19 out of 100 possible points**

This is the scoring table for physical/capital project that has a total budget for contracts that does NOT exceed \$20K AND includes single site construction proposed to use more than \$350K in PCEF funds.

Criteria	Possible points	Full points	Middle points	No points
Grant funded job hours (#FTE/\$ invested).	2.6	Top 20% of all applications received.	Middle 20% of applications received.	Lowest 20% of applications received.
Apprentice utilization rate.	3.5	This is a binary score applicants can receive if apprentice utilization meets maximum journey/apprentice ratio per apprenticeable trade.		
Inclusive apprentice recruitment.	3.5	Contractor (or applicant if self-performing) has a record of diverse apprentice	Contractor has strong strategy to recruit and	Weak or no recruitment strategy.

		utilization and strong strategy to recruit diverse apprentices.	utilize diverse apprentices.	
Inclusive apprentice utilization.	3.1	Highest 20% of all applications for diversity of apprentices used on the project.	Middle 20% of all applications for diversity of apprentices used on the project.	Lowest 20% of all applications for diversity of apprentices used on the project.
Non-apprentice workers recruitment strategy.	3.1	Contractor has a strong record of recruitment, retention, and advancement of diverse workers and strong recruitment strategy for the proposed project.	Contractor has strong strategy to recruit diverse workers on the proposed project.	Weak or no recruitment strategy.
Non-apprentice workers utilization commitments.	3.2	Highest 20% of all applications for diversity of non-apprentice workers used on the project.	Middle 20% of all applications for diversity of non-apprentice workers used on the project.	Lowest 20% of all applications for diversity of non-apprentice workers used on the project.

**Workforce and contractor benefits Table W.4: 19 out of 100 possible points**

This is the scoring table for physical/capital project that has a total budget for contracts that exceeds \$20K AND includes single site construction proposed to use more than \$350K in PCEF funds.

Criteria	Possible points	Full points	Partial points	No points
Grant funded job hours (#FTE/\$ invested).	2.0	Top 20% of all applications received.	Middle 20% of applications received.	Lowest 20% of applications received.

Strong recruitment strategy and utilization of diverse local subcontractors.	2.8	Contractor (or applicant if self-performing) has a record of diverse locally-based subcontractor utilization and strong strategy and commitments to recruit and utilize diverse local subcontractors.	Contractor (or applicant if self-performing) has strong strategy and commitments to recruit and utilize diverse local subcontractors.	Weak or no recruitment strategy and commitments.
Percent of total contract dollars reaching diverse contractors.	2.7	Top 20% of applications receive.	Middle 20% of applications receive.	Lowest 20% of applications receive.
Apprentice utilization rate.	2.4	This is a binary score applicants can receive if apprentice utilization meets maximum journey/apprentice ratio per apprenticeable trade.		
Inclusive apprentice recruitment.	2.4	Contractor (or applicant if self-performing) has a record of diverse apprentice utilization and strong strategy to recruit diverse apprentices.	Contractor has strong strategy to recruit and utilize diverse apprentices	Weak or no recruitment strategy.
Inclusive apprentice utilization commitments.	2.5	Highest 20% of all applications for diversity of apprentices used on the project.	Middle 20% of all applications for diversity of apprentices used on the project.	Lowest 20% of all applications for diversity of apprentices used on the project.
Non-apprentice workers recruitment strategy.	2.0	Contractor has a strong record of recruitment, retention, and advancement of diverse workers and strong recruitment strategy for the proposed project.	Contractor has strong strategy to recruit diverse workers on the proposed project.	Weak or no recruitment strategy.

Non-apprentice workers utilization commitments.	2.1	Highest 20% of all applications for diversity of non-apprentice workers used on the project.	Middle 20% of all applications for diversity of non-apprentice workers used on the project.	Lowest 20% of all applications for diversity of non-apprentice workers used on the project.
---	-----	--	---	---

<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, 10% = 1 point, 15% = 2 points, 20% = 3 points, 25% = 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.		