

Scoring Criteria

The table below shows the maximum number of points each component of the application can earn.

Application Component	Total Points Possible
<u>Project Description & Goals</u>	15
<u>Community Partnership, Needs, & Priorities</u>	20
<u>Climate Risks and Multiple Benefits</u>	20
<u>Regional Partnership</u>	20
<u>Organizational Capacity</u>	10
<u>Budget</u>	15
Total	100

Project Description & Goals

Information to Include and Corresponding Criteria

Include the following bolded information. The subpoints below each bolded heading show the criteria the RRGP application review panel will consider when evaluating applications:

1. Project Description

1.1. The application clearly describes the project and shows that it is eligible for the RRGP.

1.2. The application describes how the project aligns with the activities and objectives that relevant local, regional, tribal, or state plans, programs, or policies outline, including those across sectors, like transportation, housing, land use planning, public health; or those from related State grant programs (see Appendix E. Distinguishing RRGP from Related State Grant Programs in the Final RRGP Guidelines).

Example documents to align with include: [California Climate Adaptation Strategy](#), the California [Extreme Heat Action Plan](#), county or regional general plans, hazard mitigation plans, climate action plans, tribal-led plans, integrated regional water management plans, zoning, building intensity, and density requirements, design guidelines, housing elements and applicable goals, policies, and programs.

1.3. The application clearly highlights or directly quotes the exact section of the relevant local, regional, tribal, or state plan etc., that the project aligns with.

1.3.a. If the applicants' jurisdictions do not have a draft, in-progress, or adopted plan to reference, the application illustrates how they have completed similar projects and what the process will be by providing a framework or description of relevant past experience.

2. Who the project serves

2.1. The application clearly describes whom the project serves.

2.2. The application clearly defines one or more vulnerable communities and demonstrates it will primarily benefit, is located in, or represents the defined communities.

2.3. Applications qualifying for the DAC set-aside clearly identify how DACs will make up at least at least 51% of the project applicants' combined jurisdiction by Census tracts or population.

3. Expected Project Outcomes

3.1. The application clearly describes what the expected short- and long-term outcomes, including climate resiliency outcomes, will be.

3.2. The outcomes show how the project will incorporate the application components in the goals (e.g., [Community Partnership, Needs, & Priorities](#), [Climate Risks and Multiple Benefits](#), [Regional Partnership](#), [Organizational Capacity](#), [Budget](#)).

3.3. Applications qualifying for the DAC set-aside clearly explain how the project will directly benefit disadvantaged communities.

4. Work Plan

4.1. The work plan adheres to the 12- to 30-month expected end date, is detailed, has clear timelines, discrete tasks, and detailed deliverables.

Community Partnership, Needs, & Priorities

Relevant Terms

Community. Throughout this section, “community” refers to the populations the project serves, as identified in #2 under [Project Description & Goals](#).

Community partnership. Throughout this section, community partnership refers to a group of organizations and community members who share common goals and objectives, distributed roles and responsibilities, and engage in collective decision-making processes. However, they do not need to be part of the project's regional partnership structure (i.e., not applicants or co-applicants).

Information to Include and Corresponding Criteria

Include the following bolded information. The subpoints below each bolded heading show the criteria the RRGp application review panel will consider when evaluating applications:

Applications qualifying for the DAC set-aside should address how the project meets the needs and priorities of disadvantaged communities in each checklist category below.



1. What the community's needs and priorities are

- 1.1. The application clearly describes what the community's needs and priorities are.
- 1.2. The application considers and addresses the current, most pressing inequities the communities face while building resilience in built, natural, and social systems.
- 1.3. The priorities consider feasibility, adaptive capacity,¹ and building capacity.²

2. Who identified the community's needs and priorities and how

- 2.1. The application clearly describes who identified the community's needs and priorities and how they identified them.
- 2.2. The community helped or will help identify community priorities through a substantial community engagement process (e.g., by conducting a community needs assessment).
 - 2.2.a. This process meaningfully included or will include vulnerable populations or community-based organizations representing vulnerable populations.
 - 2.2.b. This community engagement process involved all affected and necessary parties, including those who may be part of the community partnership structure.
 - 2.2.c. If the application does not describe a substantial community engagement process, it includes a clear justification and plan to address this gap within the grant term by reflecting this effort in the work plan, budget, and community engagement plan.

3. How the community's needs and priorities informed the project design

- 3.1. The application clearly describes how the community's needs and priorities informed the project design.
- 3.2. The community helped define and design the project through a substantial community engagement process (e.g., collaboratively developing feasible community project ideas to reflect community needs and ensure projects reflect community priorities and expertise before developing the project).
 - 3.2.a. This process meaningfully included or will include vulnerable populations or community-based organizations representing vulnerable populations.
 - 3.2.b. This community engagement process involved or will involve all affected and necessary parties, including those who may be part of the community partnership structure.

¹ For more information, see the "adaptive capacity" definition in Appendix F: Glossary and Acronyms in the Final RRGp Guidelines.

² See tools from Appendix E: Climate Adaptation and Resilience Resources in the Final RRGp Guidelines for ideas.



3.3. The application provides clear and convincing evidence of strong community support (e.g., from those in the community partnership structure, etc.).

4. The project's community partnership and engagement plan

4.1. The application clearly describes the project's community partnership structure and how partnering with the community will build climate resiliency in its region.

4.2. The application includes a community engagement plan to meaningfully engage communities throughout the project.

4.2.a. The plan explains how it will involve vulnerable communities.

4.2.b. The engagement process makes it easy for community members to participate in meetings and in the decision-making process (e.g., the project provides stipends, meets in convenient locations or virtually, provides childcare and food, uses plain language, offers translation services for languages spoken in the community, and uses culturally appropriate methods).

4.2.c. The plan shows how materials will use accessible language and messaging (e.g., plain language, languages spoken in the community).

4.3. The application's community partnership structure represents a diversity of residents and key collaborators.

4.4. The application clearly explains how those in the community partnership structure will be involved throughout the project, from design to evaluation. Members of the community that the project serves are involved as board members, management staff, or have a leadership role in project/program development.

4.4.a. The application demonstrates how the project will clearly and meaningfully shift or share decision-making power with vulnerable communities.

Climate Risks and Multiple Benefits

Information to Include and Corresponding Criteria

Include the following bolded information. The subpoints below each bolded heading show the criteria the RRGPs application review panel will consider when evaluating applications:

Applications qualifying for the DAC set-aside should address how the project identified climate risks and multiple benefits with respect to the needs and priorities of disadvantaged communities in each checklist category below.

1. The region's greatest climate risks

1.1. The application includes a clear description and analysis of the region's greatest current and future climate risks. If the region has not yet identified the greatest climate risks, the application includes a description of local or tribal ecological knowledge of climate risks.



1.2. The region's greatest climate risks align with the risks the RRGP addresses (drought, flood, extreme heat events, increasing temperatures, sea level rise, wildfire).

2. Whether the application addresses the region's greatest climate risks

2.1. The application addresses the region's greatest climate risks identified in #1 above.

2.2. The application describes how the project will maximize resilience and address multiple, interconnected regional climate risks, where possible, using a systematic approach.

2.2.a. If it is not possible to address more than one regional climate risk due to regional needs, priorities, or other conditions, the application provides a clear and comprehensive justification and includes a plan to address this gap in the application.

3. Methods the project will use to address the climate risks

3.1. The application includes information on how the applicants evaluated opportunities during the project design process to increase resilience to the region's greatest climate risks.³

3.2. The application evaluates whether the project could use natural infrastructure to address the climate risks.

3.2.a. The project uses natural infrastructure to respond to the climate risks, where feasible.

3.2.b. If using natural infrastructure is infeasible, the application explains why.

3.2.c. The application applies systems-level thinking and problem-solving when developing the project.

3.3. The application describes the intent to use climate projections based on best available science and local and/or regional data to identify climate risks and exposures, describe the impact of climate change risks and exposures on the community, and identify and prioritize climate adaptation measures and objectives that address such impacts (For more guidance, see Appendix E: Climate Adaptation and Resilience Resources in the Final RRGP Guidelines).

3.3.a. The climate projections and science are relevant to the issue the application is trying to address, support the application, and support why this is a priority for the community.

4. The multiple benefits the project offers

4.1. The application clearly and comprehensively describes how the project will benefit communities within the project area.

³ For more information, see the "Benefits" definition in Appendix G: Glossary and Acronyms in the Final RRGP Guidelines.

4.1.a. The project prioritizes benefits toward vulnerable communities.

4.2. The benefits the project offers go beyond climate resiliency, are cross-cutting, and span sectors and climate issues.

Regional Partnership

Relevant Term

Regional Partnership consists of two or more eligible entities whose combined jurisdiction enhances their effectiveness in responding to the highest priority climate risks of that region.

Information to Include and Corresponding Criteria

Include the following bolded information. The subpoints below each bolded heading show the criteria the RRGP application review panel will consider when evaluating applications:

Applications qualifying for the DAC set-aside should address how the regional partnership meets the needs and priorities of disadvantaged communities in each checklist category below.

1. The regional partnership structure (i.e., applicant and co-applicants)

1.1. The application clearly describes the regional partnership structure.

1.2. The regional partnership includes two or more eligible entities whose combined jurisdiction enhances their effectiveness in responding to the highest priority climate risks of that region.

1.3. Regional partners reflect the community and include a diversity of eligible entities.

1.4. Regional partners bring unique strengths and approaches and a proven track record of serving communities.

1.5. The regional partnership will facilitate capacity building opportunities for co-applicants from vulnerable communities.

2. Partner responsibilities and long-term goals

2.1. The application clearly describes how the regional partners will organize themselves, manage the project, and build their network's capacity.

2.2. The application clearly describes the regional partnership's long-term goals.

2.2.a. Regional partners show commitment to equity, the ability to self-govern, and the likelihood of sustaining the partnership beyond the grant term.



2.2.b. Regional partners will evaluate and measure their progress toward achieving program objectives and describe how they intend to use the findings.

Organizational Capacity

Information to Include and Corresponding Criteria

In the organizational capacity section, the application should describe the regional partners' organizational capacity to implement the proposed activities successfully, providing examples from previous experience and plans to meet any gaps required for the RRGP.

Include the following bolded information. The subpoints below each bolded heading show the criteria the RRGP application review panel will consider when evaluating applications:

1. Administrative Experience

1.1. The application shows that at least one co-applicant in the partnership structure can manage grants and this proposal, including internal processes for financial tracking and accountability, and can coordinate amongst diverse partners.

1.2. The application demonstrates the ability to provide advanced payment to co-applicants (only if the proposal includes advanced pay as a mechanism of payment).

1.3. One of the co-applicants demonstrates a fiscal agent's expertise in gathering and reporting information on implementing the proposal.

1.4. Regional partners show commitment, readiness, and capacity to implement the proposed work on time and within budget.

2. Programmatic Expertise

2.2. The application demonstrates that the applicants possess strong programmatic expertise.

3. Plans to Meet Capacity Gaps

3.1. The application clearly describes how the regional partners plan to close capacity gaps, including those related to administrative and programmatic expertise, to complete the project.

3.2. The work plan and budget show how the applicants will maintain or create sustainable staffing levels to support capacity building.

Budget

Information to Include and Corresponding Criteria

The application should include a budget and a written narrative explaining the budget's allocations and reasons for proposed expenditures. The subpoints below each bolded heading show the criteria the RRG application review panel will consider when evaluating applications:

The budget should:

1. Align with the RRG

1.1. The total budget allocates 3-15% towards Evaluation Activities to support the applicants' time engaging with the RRG's evaluation activities.

1.2. The total budget allocates up to 5% towards Peer-to-Peer Learning to support the applicants' time engaging with the RRG's peer-to-peer learning activities.

1.3. The budget only includes eligible costs (see the Note section for the Budget Application Component in Section 3.2. Application Components & Scoring Criteria in the RRG Guidelines).

2. Align with the project goals and work plan

2.1. The budget is realistic, reflecting organizational strengths and experiences, and feasible financial projections within the 12- to 30-month grant period.

2.2. The budget aligns with the project goals and activities outlined within the application and work plan.

2.3. The budget has reasonable tasks and deliverables, feasible financial projections, and considers the grant term's timelines.

2.4. The budget includes funding from sources other than the RRG, if applicable.

3. Be detailed and complete

3.1. The budget clearly outlines proposed activities, broken down by task and line item. It shows how the project will allocate resources across co-applicants and partners to lead or support specific activities, reasonable tasks, and deliverables.

3.2. The budget considers the number of funded partners, number and complexity of activities, consultant services and other contracting needs, and community engagement and participation costs.

3.3. The budget is thorough, showing an understanding of proposed activities.

3.4. The budget allocates resources across entities within the collaborative based on their strengths and experience to lead or support specific activities.



3.5. The budget includes all necessary supporting justifications.



Component Point Scale

Reviewers will assess how well the proposal meets each evaluation criterion using the following scale. The score ranges vary by the maximum points each application component may earn. To see the maximum points and the example scoring criterion, see the table on page 1.

Point Scale	Component Max. Points: 20	Component Max. Points: 15	Component Max. Points: 10
Excellent: All criteria are addressed with the highest degree of confidence in the response or proposed solution. Exceeds the requirements in providing multiple enhancing features, a creative approach, or an exceptional solution.	17 - 20	12 - 15	9 - 10
Very good: fully addresses the criteria with a high degree of confidence in the response or proposed solution. Offers one or more enhancing features, methods, or approaches that exceed basic expectations.	12 - 16	9 - 11	7 - 8
Good: fully addresses the criteria with a good degree of confidence in the proposer's response or proposed solution. No identified omissions, flaws, or defects. Any identified weaknesses are minimal, inconsequential, and acceptable. Gaps in meeting criteria are accompanied by a strong justification and plan to address gaps in the grant term.	8 - 11	6 - 8	4 - 6
Fair: Inadequately addresses the criteria. Any omissions, flaws, or defects are inconsequential and acceptable.	4 - 7	3 - 5	2 - 3
Poor: does not adequately address the criteria. One or more omissions, flaws, or defects or the criteria are addressed in a limited way that results in a low degree of confidence in the proposed solution.	0 - 3	0 - 2	0 - 1

-- END OF DOCUMENT--

