

MEMO: Small and Large Grant Scoring for 8.12.20 Committee Meeting discussion

At the August 5th, 2020 PCEF Committee Meeting the Committee discussed the weighting of different sections of the scoring criteria for both small and large grants. The Committee expressed a desire to see consistency in the weight put on criteria: that benefit applicants who reflect the community served by the project; for serving PCEF priority populations; and criteria related to the budget. Staff took this guidance and have held these three sections of scoring constant in a way that holds budget to 10 percent of total score and ensures 50 percent of the total score is determined by criteria that benefit applicants who reflect the community served by the project and for serving PCEF priority populations. There are some differences in other sections of scoring for both small and large grants; the reason for those differences is noted in the memo that follows. For ease of comparison and use we have also normalized all scores to 100 and rounded to the nearest whole number.

There are seven different sets of scoring criteria that apply to an application depending on type; four for large grants and three for small grants.

1. Large grants – with physical improvements and a construction budget at a single site of \$500,000 or greater. These types of projects will require a construction workforce and have the greatest depth of information requested and scored for the workforce and contractor benefits scoring criteria.
2. Large grants - with a physical improvements but lacking a construction budget at a single site of \$500,000 or greater. These projects may include scattered sites (e.g. multiple homes) that together have a construction budget of more than \$500,000 but do not meet that threshold at any single site. These types of projects are scored on fewer workforce and contractor benefits criteria because it is not reasonable to require that a prime or general contractor be identified prior to receiving a grant award.
3. Large grants – with physical improvements but with no need for a construction workforce. These projects are likely to include green infrastructure and regenerative agriculture projects which will have physical infrastructure but will not require the kind of workforce asked about in the workforce and contractor benefits scoring criteria.
4. Large grants – no physical improvements and no construction workforce. This type of project has substantially fewer scoring criteria related to environmental benefits and to workforce and contractor benefits. These projects may include workforce development and training grants, education and community engagement, etc.
5. Small grants – with physical improvements requiring a construction workforce. These projects are the only small grant type with scoring criteria in the workforce and contractor benefits section.
6. Small grants – with physical improvements but with no need for a construction workforce. These projects are likely to include green infrastructure and regenerative agriculture projects which will have physical infrastructure but will not require the kind of workforce asked about in the workforce and contractor benefits scoring criteria.
7. Small grants - no physical improvements and no construction workforce. This type of project has substantially fewer scoring criteria related to environmental benefits and to workforce and contractor benefits. These projects may include workforce development and training grants, education and community engagement, etc.

LARGE GRANTS

Large grants > \$200,000 to \$1 million: Distribution of points				
	Physical improvements, Const Single Site \$500K & OVER	Physical improvements, Const Single site Less than \$500K	Physical improvements, NO construction workforce	NO physical improvements, NO construction workforce
Preference for reflecting community served	10 %	15 %	15 %	15 %
Serving PCEF priority population	40 %	35 %	35 %	35 %
Project description and scope	15 %	15 %	17 %	27 %
Environmental benefits	18 %	18 %	16 %	7 %
Budget	10 %	10 %	10 %	10 %
Other	7 %	7 %	7 %	6 %
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %	100 %

Differences in point distribution

The distribution of points (i.e., relative weights of categories) is mostly constant across the project types for large grants, with two main exceptions:

- All grants provide 50 percent of the potential points to preference for reflecting community served and serving PCEF priority populations. Large grants with physical improvements that include a single site construction budget of \$500,000 or greater have a slightly different distribution of points between these two categories. For these grants (single site construction budgets \$500,000+) the split is 10/40, while for all other large grant types the split is 15/35. The primary reason for this difference is that projects with single site construction budgets \$500,000+ have five additional criteria in the workforce benefits section of the scoring criteria that contribute to the total score for serving PCEF priority populations.
- For grants that have no physical improvements, the environmental benefits score is lower because there is only one criteria for this scoring category and it has a lower level of rigor associated with its estimate (GHG reduction/sequestration will result from project activities unrelated to physical improvements).

Differences in application and weight of scoring criteria

- We have maintained consistency in the relative value of each individual criteria across project types unless there was a reason to do otherwise. Scoring adjustments are driven by differences in confidence of model/measures of criteria, consideration of differences in the types of activities we anticipate, and the total number of criteria being scored.

The table on the following page shows which criteria are scored for each of the four project scenarios. For the criteria that are within the categories of *Preference for reflecting the community served*, and *Budget* all criteria are scored for all project types. For the categories of *Serving PCEF priority population*, *Project description and scope*, *Environmental benefits* and *Other* there is at least one, and sometimes substantial, differences in which criteria are scored depending on project type. The differences between project types in which scoring criteria apply are based on: 1) the type of workforce needed to complete the project (i.e., projects with construction related improvements have questions about workers and contractors) and 2) whether or not the project has physical improvements with measurable GHG emissions reduction and/or sequestration.

Summary of criteria for scoring LARGE grant applications

		Physical improvements, Const single site OVER \$500K	Physical improvements, Const single site Less than \$500K	Physical improvements, NO construction workforce	NO physical improvements, NO construction workforce
Preference for reflecting	Organization demonstrates strong understanding and practice around community organizing, outreach, and/or stakeholder engagement, focus on historically marginalized and culturally diverse communities.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Staff (including leadership) and board of the organization reflect the community their proposed project is intended to benefit.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Serving PCEF priority population(s)	Organization has a track record of delivering programs that benefit economically disadvantaged community members, including people of color, women, people with disabilities, and/or the chronically underemployed.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Percent of project benefits to specific PCEF priority populations.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Project reduces cost for people with low income and/or communities of color.	✓	✓	✓	
	Project provides health benefits to PCEF priority populations.	✓	✓	✓	
	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	✓	✓	✓	
	Strong strategy for recruitment and utilization of diverse local contractors and subcontractors.	✓	✓		
	Percent of total contract dollars reaching diverse subcontractors.	✓			
	Inclusive apprentice recruitment.	✓			
	Inclusive apprentice utilization commitments.	✓			
	Non-apprentice workers recruitment strategy.	✓			
	Non-apprentice workers utilization commitments.	✓			
Other	Organization provides benefits to employees.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Applicant demonstrates ability to manage funds responsibly and effectively.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Project provides other social benefit not already included in other criteria.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Apprentice utilization rate.	✓			
	For projects less than \$350,000 the project pays prevailing wages to workers in trades for which a prevailing wage is defined.		✓		
Project Description and Scope	Project description is complete and intended outcomes are clear.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Services, activities, and timeline described in scope will realistically result in intended outcomes.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Appropriate plan to maintain project for lifecycle (beyond grant life).	✓	✓	✓	
	Project team including non-profit staff, contractors, and other partners have demonstrated experience that will support project success.	✓	✓	✓	✓
Environmental Benefits	Indirect GHG reduction/sequestration will result from project activities not associated with physical improvements and/or infrastructure.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Materials and supplies are selected based on embedded carbon and other environmental and health impacts.	✓	✓	✓	
	GHG emissions reduction (including sequestration) impact (GHG reduction/\$ total budget for project life)	✓	✓	✓	
	Project provides meaningful additional non-GHG environmental benefits	✓	✓	✓	
Budget	Project budget complete and reasonable.	✓	✓	✓	✓
	Project leverage	✓	✓	✓	✓

SMALL GRANTS

Small grants up to \$200,000 - Distribution of points			
	Physical improvements WITH construction workforce	Physical improvements, NO construction workforce	NO physical improvements, NO construction workforce
Preference for reflecting community served	15 %	15 %	15 %
Serving PCEF priority population	35 %	35 %	35 %
Project description and scope	15 %	18 %	27 %
Environmental benefits	16 %	16 %	7 %
Budget	10 %	10 %	10 %
Other	9 %	6 %	6 %
Total	100 %	100 %	100 %

Differences in point distribution

The distribution of points (i.e., relative weights of categories) is mostly constant across the project types for small grants, with two main exceptions:

- For grants that have no physical improvements, the environmental benefits score is lower because there is only one criteria for this scoring category and it has a lower level of rigor associated with its estimate (GHG reduction/sequestration will result from project activities unrelated to physical improvements).
- For projects with no physical improvements, more points (weight) go to the project description and scope. This reflects the fact that these projects do not have an opportunity to earn as many points in the environment section or other social benefits sections. For these types of projects, the strength of the programming provides the greatest opportunity to distinguish strong applicants.

Differences in application and weight of scoring criteria

- Within each of the funding categories we have maintained consistency in relative value of criteria across project types unless there was a reason to do otherwise. Scoring adjustments for each of the project types are driven by differences in confidence of model/measures of criteria, consideration of differences in the types of activities we anticipate, and the total number of criteria being scored.

The table on the following page shows which criteria are scored for each of the three small grant project scenarios. For the criteria that are within the categories of *Preference for reflecting the community served*, *Project description and scope*, and *Budget* all criteria are scored for all project types. For the categories of *Serving PCEF priority population*, *Environmental benefits* and *Other* there is at least one, and sometimes substantial, differences in which criteria are scored depending on project type. The differences between project types in which scoring criteria apply are based on: 1) the type of workforce needed to complete the project (i.e., projects with construction related improvements have questions about workers and contractors) and 2) whether or not the project has physical improvements with measurable GHG emissions reduction and/or sequestration.

Summary of criteria for scoring SMALL grant applications

		Physical improvements WITH construction workforce	Physical improvements, NO construction workforce	NO physical improvements, NO construction workforce
Preference for reflecting	Organization demonstrates strong understanding and practice around community organizing, outreach, and/or stakeholder engagement, focus on historically marginalized and culturally diverse communities.	✓	✓	✓
	Staff (including leadership) and board of the organization reflect the community their proposed project is intended to benefit.	✓	✓	✓
Serving PCEF priority population(s)	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.	✓	✓	✓
	Project reduces cost for people with low income and/or communities of color.	✓	✓	
	Project provides health benefits to PCEF priority populations.	✓	✓	
	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	✓	✓	
	Percent of project benefits to specific PCEF priority populations.	✓	✓	✓
	Strong strategy for recruitment and utilization of diverse local contractors and subcontractors.	✓		
Other	Organization provides benefits to employees.	✓	✓	✓
	Application demonstrates organization's ability to manage funds responsibly.	✓	✓	✓
	Project provides other social benefit not already included in other criteria.	✓	✓	✓
	Project pays prevailing wages to workers in trades for which a prevailing wage is defined.*	✓		
Project Description and Scope	Project description is complete and intended outcomes are clear.	✓	✓	✓
	Services and activities described in scope will realistically result in intended outcomes.	✓	✓	✓
	Project team (includes non-profit staff, contractors, and other partners) have professional and/or life experience that will support project success.	✓	✓	✓
Environmental Benefits	GHG emissions impact (GHG reduction or sequestration/\$ total budget for project life).	✓	✓	
	GHG reduction/sequestration (indirect) will result from project activities that are unrelated to physical improvements.	✓	✓	✓
	Project provides meaningful additional non-GHG environmental benefits.	✓	✓	
Budget	Project budget complete and reasonable.	✓	✓	✓
	Project leverage	✓	✓	✓