

Climate Pollution Reduction Grant Evaluation Criteria

A. Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Points
<p>1. Overall Project Summary and Approach</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (20 points) Description of GHG Reduction Measures. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provides a detailed description of each of the proposed GHG reduction measures to be undertaken; ● Describes the major features, tasks, milestones, and potential risks for each measure; ● In the case of a coalition application, describes the roles and responsibilities of each coalition member in the project design and implementation; and, ● Explains how each GHG reduction measure relates to a priority GHG reduction measure included in the relevant PCAP, why each measure was selected as a priority, and how each measure will meet the goals of the CPRG program. ● (10 points) Demonstration of Funding Need. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Demonstrates a strong need for EPA CPRG implementation funding; ● Explains if and how other funding streams have been explored, and why these sources are not sufficient; and, ● Lists federal and non-federal funding sources the applicant has applied for, has secured, and/or will secure to implement the GHG reduction measures, if applicable. ● (15 points) Transformative Impact. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it demonstrates that the GHG reduction measures have the potential to create transformative opportunities or impacts that can lead to significant additional GHG emissions reductions. 	<p>45</p>

Evaluation Criteria	Points
<p>2. Impact of GHG Reduction Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (20 points) Magnitude of GHG Reductions from 2025 through 2030. The application will be evaluated on the magnitude of cumulative GHG emission reductions and the durability of the reductions to be achieved by the proposed GHG reduction measures from 2025 through 2030, using appropriate methodologies and assumptions. Applications will be assessed on the estimated emission reductions that will directly result from EPA CPRG implementation grant funding. ● (10 points) Magnitude of GHG Reductions from 2025 through 2050. The application will be evaluated on the magnitude of cumulative GHG emission reductions and the durability of the reductions to be achieved by the proposed GHG reduction measures from 2025 through 2050, using appropriate methodologies and assumptions. Applications will be assessed on the estimated emission reductions that will directly result from EPA CPRG implementation grant funding. ● (15 points) Cost Effectiveness of GHG Reductions. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Cost effectiveness of the GHG reduction measures in terms of the CPRG implementation grant dollars requested divided by cumulative GHG metric ton of CO₂-equivalent emission reductions to be achieved from 2025 through 2030 for the set of measures in the application, and ● Qualitative narrative explaining any factors that may affect the cost- effectiveness calculation. ● (15 points) Documentation of GHG Reduction Assumptions. The application will be evaluated on the quality, thoroughness, reasonableness, and comprehensiveness of the methodologies, assumptions, and calculations used for developing the estimated GHG emission reductions for the GHG reduction measures included in the application, including GHG reductions from 2025 through 2030; GHG reductions from 2025 through 2050; and, the estimated cost per metric ton of CO₂-equivalent GHG reductions to be achieved from 2025 through 2030 for the collection of measures in the application. 	<p>60</p>

<p>3. Environmental Results – Outputs, Outcomes, and Performance Measures</p> <p>a. (10 points) Expected Outputs and Outcomes. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it identifies expected outputs and outcomes, as defined in Section I.C for each GHG measure, including listing GHG emission reductions and listing co-pollution (CAP and HAP) emission changes as outcomes, among others.</p>	<p>30</p>
--	------------------

Evaluation Criteria	Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (10 points) Performance Measures and Plan. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and the extent to which it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provides a clear description of the proposed performance measures to track, measure, and report progress toward achieving the expected outputs and outcomes for each GHG reduction measure, and ● Describes the plan for effectively tracking and measuring progress in implementing each GHG reduction measure. ● (10 points) Authorities, Implementation Timeline, and Milestones. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Identifies the parties and their roles and responsibilities for implementing each GHG reduction measure; ● For each measure, describes whether the implementing entity has current authority to carry out the measure and if they do not, articulates the plan and timing for obtaining it during the grant period; and, ● Provides the detailed implementation timeline for each measure, including key milestones for specific tasks, and discusses the key actions needed to meet the project goals and objectives by the end of the grant period. 	

<p>4. Low-Income and Disadvantaged Communities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (25 points) Community Benefits. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provides a comprehensive discussion and assessment of expected benefits and/or avoided disbenefits to low-income and disadvantaged communities from the proposed GHG reduction measures; ● Lists CEJST Census tract IDs or EPA’s EJScreen Census block group IDs for areas that may be affected by GHG reduction measures; and, ● Describes the plan to assess, quantify, and report a more thorough quantitative analysis of associated community benefits, including co- pollutant (CAP and HAP) emission reductions. ● (10 points) Community Engagement. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Explains how input from low-income and disadvantaged communities was incorporated into the application, and ● Describes how meaningful engagement with low-income and disadvantaged communities will be continuously included in the implementation of the GHG reduction measures. 	<p>35</p>
--	------------------

Evaluation Criteria	Points
<p>5. Job Quality (5 points). The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it describes, as applicable, concrete strategies and commitments to ensure job quality, strong labor standards, and a diverse, highly skilled workforce for the implementation of the GHG reduction measures.</p>	<p>5</p>

6. Programmatic Capability and Past Performance

30

- (10 points) Past Performance. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it demonstrates that the applicant has past performance in successfully managing and completing the federal assistance agreements as described in Section IV.B.
- (10 points) Reporting Requirements. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it:
 - Demonstrates that the applicant has a history of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in the project narrative as described in Section IV.B, and
 - Describes whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements; the extent to which the applicant adequately and timely reported on their progress towards achieving the expected outputs and outcomes under those agreements; and, if sufficient progress was not being made, whether the applicant adequately reported the reason for insufficient progress.
- (10 points) Staff Expertise. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it demonstrates that the applicant has the requisite organizational experience, including staff expertise and qualifications, staff knowledge, and resources or ability of obtain them, to successfully achieve the goals of the proposed project.

Note: In evaluating applicants under criteria 6.a and 6.b, EPA will consider the information provided by the applicant and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including agency files and prior/current grantors (e.g., to verify and/or supplement the information supplied by the applicant). If the applicant does not have any relevant or available past performance or reporting information, please indicate this in the application. The application will receive a neutral score for criteria 6.a and 6.b. A neutral score is 5 points of 10 possible points for each criterion. If the applicant does not provide any response for these items, they may receive a score of 0 for these criteria.

Evaluation Criteria	Points
<p>7. Budget and Timely Expenditure of Grant Funds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● (20 points) Budget Detail. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which the proposed budget provides a detailed breakout by funding type in the proper budget category for each activity for which the applicant is requesting funding. ● (15 points) Expenditure of Awarded Funds. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which it demonstrates that the approach, procedures, and controls described in the application will ensure that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner. ● (10 points) Reasonableness of Cost. The application will be evaluated on the quality of the response and extent to which the proposed grant expenditures are reasonable for accomplishing the proposed goals, objectives, and measurable environmental outcomes described in the application. 	<p>45</p>
<p>Total</p>	<p>250</p>