



## EPA Community Change Grants Evaluation Criteria

### Track II Application Review Process and Evaluation Criteria

All eligible Track II applications will be evaluated on a 100-point scale using the criteria specified below. **There will be no oral presentation component for the Track II applications.**

Track II applications that score at least 85 points will be referred to the Selection Official for final selection consideration as described in Section V.E below. Those Track II applications whose total score is below 85 will be ranked by EPA staff and reviewed on an approximately monthly basis by the Selection Official. Those not selected for award during the monthly review will receive notification from EPA and may request a debriefing as explained in the Section VI: Debriefings and Disputes clauses are included in the [EPA Solicitation Clauses](#) incorporated by reference in the NOFO. Applicants may resubmit an application in certain circumstances as noted in Section II.C.

### Evaluation Criteria for Track II Applications

Track II applications will be evaluated using the criteria below on a 100-point scale. The evaluation criteria summarized in the table below correspond to the Track II Application Project Narrative components described in Section IV.B. To assist EPA reviewers, applicants should reference the numbers and titles of the evaluation criteria in their Project Narratives to help identify where the criteria are being addressed as applicable.

### Track II Evaluation Criteria

Section	Possible Points
1. Program Objectives	35
2. Project Collaboration and Participation	20
3. Project Linkages	4
4. Budget	8
5. Environmental Results	6
6. CBO Experience & Commitment	5
7. Programmatic and Managerial Capability and Resources	16

8. Past Performance	6
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100</b>

**1. Track II Program Objectives (35 points):** Applications will be evaluated based on the quality and extent to which they demonstrate:

- How the project(s) in the application address the Track II objectives identified in Section I.H. **(10 points)**
- The methods, tools, and trainings, the applicant will use to facilitate the engagement of disadvantaged communities in state and Federal advisory groups, workshops, rulemakings, and / or other public processes, including local, Tribal, and other governmental processes, related to environmental and climate justice. **(10 points)**
- How the project(s) in the application address and improve the disadvantaged community's lack of access to, or weak relationships with, governmental entities and changes those relationships to increase points of access for disadvantaged communities with government to work cooperatively to promote environmental and climate justice. **(8 points)**
- Will result in governmental entities better understanding the root causes of environmental and climate justice issues that impact disadvantaged communities, so the communities are better prepared to proactively address them before the issues materialize. **(7 points)**

**2. Project Collaboration and Participation (20 points):** Under this criterion, applications will be evaluated based on the quality and extent to which they:

- Demonstrate that meaningful input and feedback was considered from the disadvantaged community and other stakeholders in designing and developing the applications and how feedback / input will continue to be obtained and considered during grant performance. **(10 points)**
- Describe the facilitation and accountability measures to establish and maintain trust between the disadvantaged community and government officials to ensure the community can collaborate in a meaningful manner on environmental and climate justice issues with governmental bodies. **(5 points)**
- Demonstrate the applicant's and Collaborating Entities relationships and history of collaborations with disadvantaged communities, governmental bodies, and other stakeholders to address environmental and environmental / climate justice issues. **(5 points)**

**3. Project linkages (4 points):** Applications will be evaluated based on the extent and quality to which the proposed project activities support and advance EPA Strategic Plan Goal 2 (Take Decisive Action to Advance Environmental Justice and Civil Rights), Objective 2.1, (Promote Environmental Justice and Civil Rights at the Federal, Tribal, State, and Local Levels).

**4. Budget (8 points):** Under this criterion, applicants will be evaluated based on:

- The reasonableness of the budget and allowability of the costs for each component / activity of the project and their approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that awarded grant funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner to comply with the statutory 3- year project period limitation. **(4 points)**
  - The cost effectiveness of the budget / project in terms of maximizing the share of funds used for the delivery of benefits to disadvantaged communities (both the direct costs of funds passed through for financial assistance as well as associated indirect costs to the greatest extent practicable). **(4 points)**
- 5. Environmental Results (6 points):** Applications will be evaluated based on the quality and extent to which:
- They describe an effective plan, with associated timeframes, for tracking and measuring their progress in achieving the expected project outcomes and outputs for Track II applications including those identified in Appendix F. **(3 points)**
  - They demonstrate that the project can ensure sustainability of outcomes beyond the three- year grant period, and how they will leverage resources, community support, etc. to facilitate this. **(3 points)**
  - The quality and specificity of the proposed outputs and outcomes, and how they will lead to the success of the grants, are described. **(3 points)**
- 6. CBO Experience and Commitment (5 points):** The CBO(s) that are either the Lead Applicant and / or Statutory Partner for the grant will be evaluated based on their history and experience as a CBO and the depth of their commitment, connections, and relationships with the disadvantaged communities the application is intended to benefit.
- 7. Programmatic and Managerial Capability and Resources (16 points):** The Lead Applicant and Statutory Partner will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete, oversee, and manage the award considering:
- Their organizational experience and capacity related to performing the proposed projects or similar activities (e.g., experience in managing projects and activities like those in the application). **(4 points)**
  - Their resources, capacity, capabilities, staff (e.g., project manager and other key personnel), expertise, and skills to perform and manage the award activities effectively during the three-year award period. For Lead Applicants submitting two applications under this NOFO, this includes how they demonstrate they have the above attributes to perform, manage, and oversee two awards effectively within the three-year award period. **(4 points)**
  - The milestone schedule for the proposed projects (up to three years) including the breakout of the project activities into phases and timeframes for completion of tasks, and the approach, procedures, and controls for ensuring that the award funds will be expended in a timely and efficient manner while ensuring that costs are eligible, reasonable, and allowable. **(3 points)**
  - Their legal and financial controls in place, and capacity to manage taxpayer dollars ethically and efficiently as well as the policies and controls for project oversight and program risk. This includes the extent and quality to which the application includes controls to identify waste, fraud, and abuse, and reduce the potential for waste, fraud, and abuse by including plans and policies for program oversight, including confidential reporting (e.g., whistleblower protections). **(5 points)**
- 8. Past Performance (6 points total):** The Lead Applicant will be evaluated based on their ability to successfully complete and manage the proposed projects considering their:

- Past performance in successfully completing and managing the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV. **(3 points)**
- History of meeting the reporting requirements under the assistance agreements identified in response to Section IV including whether the applicant submitted acceptable final technical reports under those agreements and 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 such progress was not being made whether the applicant adequately reported why not. **(3 points)**

The focus of this criterion is on the Lead Applicant's past performance and not that of any other Collaborating Entities or contractors / consultants who may be assisting the applicant with performance of the project. In evaluating the Lead Applicant under these factors, EPA will consider the information provided in the application and may also consider relevant information from other sources, including information from EPA files and from current / prior grantors. **If you do not have any relevant or available past performance related to federal or non-federal grants, you should state this explicitly in your application (e.g., our organization has no relevant past grants experience). Including this statement will ensure you receive a neutral score for these factors (a neutral score is half of the total points available in a subset of possible points). Failure to include this statement may result in your receiving a score of 0 for these factors.**