

## Attachment I: MVP Action Grant Program Scoring Criteria Quick Reference

### MUNICIPAL VULNERABILITY PREPAREDNESS PROGRAM FY 23

#### MVP ACTION GRANT

#### RFR ENV 23 MVP 02

Evaluation Criterion	Description
<b><i>Project Description, Rationale, and Climate Data (13 points)</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to <b>8 points</b> for description &amp; rationale, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What climate change impacts/vulnerabilities this project will address <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If applicable, please reference the RMAT Climate Resilience Standards Tool climate exposure ratings and how the project is responding to the climate exposures identified through the tool.</li> </ul> </li> <li>What the project's goals and objectives are. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the project is one component/phase of a larger project, please succinctly describe previously completed or future work and the vision for the overall project in addition to the proposed component/phase.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Why the project was chosen. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How the project will positively impact the <a href="#">resiliency</a> of the site and community.</li> <li>If applicable, please include quantifiable information about the historic or expected future damages that are likely to occur if the project is not completed (e.g., number of people/homes/structures at risk, number of people depending on the infrastructure being improved, extent of past flooding, expected cost if infrastructure fails, etc.).</li> </ul> </li> <li>How the project reflects municipal priorities established in the community's MVP-approved report or subsequent climate resilience report that built upon the MVP process.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>1 point</b> for utilization and report from the <a href="#">RMAT Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool</a> if project is focused on a specific site and includes physical asset/s -- e.g., building, infrastructure, natural resources-- at any project phase</li> <li>Up to <b>3 points</b> for the degree to which the most up-to-date climate science and data (including data found on <a href="#">resilientma.org</a>, the <a href="#">RMAT Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool</a>, and/or local-level studies) will be utilized, including specific reference to the climate data utilized. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>For Project Type 1:</b> Planning, Assessments, Capacity Building, and Regulatory Updates-- What climate data will be used to inform the process or report and how will they be utilized? If it is a regulatory project, how will the regulations use climate data to ensure they will provide reasonable and effective guidance into the future? If it is a project that focuses on a specific site and involves a physical asset, how will the project utilize the preliminary</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p>climate risk rating and recommended design standards from the <a href="#">RMAT Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool</a> at this assessment phase of the project?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>For Project Type 2:</b> Design and Permitting – How will the project utilize the preliminary climate risk rating and recommended design standards from the <a href="#">RMAT Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool</a> in the design of the project’s physical assets? What other climate data and standards will be used to inform the design process and how will they be utilized?</li> <li>○ <b>For Project Type 3:</b> Construction and On-the-Ground Implementation – How does the proposed design meet or fail to meet the recommendations in the <a href="#">RMAT Climate Resilience Design Standards Tool</a> output report? (e.g. planning horizon, return periods, design criteria, methodology). If the proposed design does not follow the recommended design standards, please explain how climate science, data, and projections were used to inform the design of the project. Please cite specific data sources. If a different type of implementation project (e.g., land acquisition) describe how climate data informed the project.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>1 point</b> for inclusion of MVP yearly progress report unless MVP Planning Grant process was completed within the last year (<a href="#">Attachment D</a>)</li> </ul>
<b><i>Timeline, Scope, and Budget (15 points)</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to <b>4 points</b> for project scope. Please detail each task/step of the project here and include a summarized version in <a href="#">Attachment B</a>. For each task, please identify if it is dependent on completion of another task.</li> <li>• Up to <b>4 points</b> for the project budget. Applicants will include budget numbers for each task and sub-task via <a href="#">Attachment B</a>. There is a place to upload Attachment B as an Excel spreadsheet on the online form. The “optional budget data” tab on the spreadsheet is optional but can be used to calculate budget numbers to the extent helpful, identify assumed rates for project team time and municipal in-kind match, or justify high grant funding requests for specific tasks by providing greater detail. The Applicant may also use another format to provide greater detail on these items (e.g., a quote from a contractor or a separate spreadsheet). There is a spot to upload additional materials on the online form.</li> <li>• Up to <b>4 points</b> for a clear project timeline that can be completed within the specified contract period. For projects that require completion of <a href="#">Attachment C</a>, please include major milestones, regulatory touchpoints and approvals, and information on how any project planning, design, and regulatory compliance efforts will be met during the grant period. Please ensure the timeline dates align with start and end dates for each task in <a href="#">Attachment B</a>.</li> <li>• Up to <b>3 points</b> for identification of regulatory project components (including satisfactory completion of <a href="#">Attachment C</a> if a design, permitting, or construction project). Documented coordination with applicable regulatory agency/ies is encouraged. Projects with significant regulatory compliance barriers identified through assessment of <a href="#">Attachment C</a> or construction projects that do not have</li> </ul>

	<p>all necessary permits and permissions in hand may be disqualified. There is a place on the online form to upload <a href="#">Attachment C</a>.</p>
<p><b><i>Nature-Based Solutions and Environmental Co-Benefits (16 points)</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to <b>10 points</b> for the degree to which nature-based solutions (i.e., solutions that protect, restore, or manage ecological systems) are incorporated into the overall vision of this project and how the selected strategy/ies will help the community adapt to existing and projected impacts of climate change. More information about nature-based solutions can be found in the <a href="#">MVP toolkit</a>. Consider the following questions in your response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>For Project Type 1:</b> Planning, Assessments, Capacity Building, and Regulatory Updates– How will this work “set the stage” for future implementation of nature-based solutions?</li> <li><b>For Project Type 2:</b> Design and Permitting – Describe all design options (including nature-based options) that will be evaluated or considered in the design process.</li> <li><b>For Project Type 3:</b> Construction and On-the-Ground Implementation – What are the nature-based solutions being implemented? If the project is not nature-based, describe a clear assessment of design alternatives and discussion of why a nature-based solution was not chosen.</li> </ul> <p><u>(Note: Hard infrastructure projects in any phase may still receive a maximum of <b>5 points</b> for a response to this question that demonstrates why this approach was deemed necessary over nature-based approaches and illustrates how environmental conditions will improve with grey infrastructure implementation.)</u></p> </li> <li>Up to <b>6 points</b> for identifying and describing environmental co-benefits of the proposed project in the table in the application. For non-implementation projects, please identify how this work will “set the stage” for future co-benefits.</li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Environmental Justice and Public/Regional Benefits (14 points)</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Up to <b>8 points</b> for a project located within a mapped EJ Population, identified through the Massachusetts <a href="#">EJ viewer</a>, <b>with demonstrated positive impacts to that community and demonstrated support from the community</b>. To receive full points, the Applicant should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide specific relevant demographic information related to the Environmental Justice Population (i.e., income, race, and English isolation) and a description of where the community is located geographically relative to the project site.</li> <li>Demonstrate how the project will increase climate resiliency for this EJ Population.</li> <li>Demonstrate support from the EJ Population that the project is intended to benefit. Demonstration of support may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Letters of support from residents or community groups representing these populations.</li> <li>Indication that residents or community groups representing these populations will be part of the project team (i.e., the community liaison model described in <a href="#">Attachment F</a>) and, <b>if so</b>,</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<p><b>specifically how much of the project budget will be used to compensate them for their work and on what tasks?</b> (Please make sure this partnership is easily identifiable in your <a href="#">Attachment B</a> scope/budget).</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Recognizing that there may be members of your community who are highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change that do not meet the specific criteria or thresholds of an EJ population, the MVP program also recognizes benefits to and involvement of “Climate Vulnerable Populations.” Climate Vulnerable Populations are those who have lower adaptive capacity or higher exposure and sensitivity to climate hazards like flooding or heat stress due to factors such as access to transportation, income level, disability, racial inequity, health status, or age. Projects that benefit and involve Climate Vulnerable Populations outside of a mapped EJ area may receive <b>up to 4 points</b> in this category by answering the above questions for the Climate Vulnerable Population(s).</p> <p>More information on Environmental Justice, Climate Vulnerable Populations, and the MVP program can be found in the <a href="#">MVP toolkit</a>.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to <b>3 points</b> for the degree to which the project has broad and multiple community benefits. Rationale should include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ How the project will provide the highest level of climate resilience for the greatest number of people and/or largest geographic area possible.</li> <li>○ What community co-benefits the project will provide (e.g., social, economic, public health, recreational, public access, equity, etc.). Please focus on non-environmental co-benefits as environmental co-benefits are included in Question 3 above.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Up to <b>3 points</b> if the project is regional/has regional benefits, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ If the project is being led by a regional partnership (i.e., two or more municipalities are submitting the application together). If yes, the application should include a letter of support from each partnering municipality.</li> <li>○ To what extent resilience benefits of the project go beyond the boundaries of one municipality.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b><i>Public Involvement and Community Engagement (12 points)</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 point for each principal strategy (<b>up to 3 points total</b>) as described in the narrative and table in the application. May have one per print, digital, and in-person category or distribute among those categories (e.g., two in-person, one print, no digital). <b>The review team will consider the effectiveness of each identified strategy and inclusion in the project scope/budget when awarding points.</b></li> <li>• 0.5 points for each assisting strategy (<b>up to 3 points total</b>) as described in narrative and table in the application. May distribute among print, digital, and in-person categories as desired. <b>The review team will consider the effectiveness of each identified strategy and inclusion in the project scope/budget when</b></li> </ul>

	<p><b>awarding points.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 point for each equitable engagement modifier (<b>up to 4 points total</b>) as described in the narrative and table in the application. May distribute among print, digital, and in-person categories as desired. <b>The review team will consider the effectiveness of each identified strategy and inclusion in the project scope/budget when awarding points.</b></li> <li>• Up to <b>2 points</b> for how stakeholder feedback will be incorporated into the project and mechanism by which stakeholders will be notified of the results of the public involvement and community engagement process and the final project deliverables (see examples in <a href="#">Attachment F</a>).</li> </ul> <p><b>NOTE: For Project Type 3: Construction and On-the-Ground Implementation</b> – Applicants may fill out the table/narrative and receive points based on community engagement strategies that have occurred in earlier phases of the specific project and how feedback has been incorporated into the final design. Applicants may also describe strategies that will be employed during this project phase. Please make clear which strategies have been completed and which are proposed to be conducted within the proposed phase of the project.</p>
<p><b>Project Transferability, Measurement of Success, and Maintenance (8 points)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to <b>4 points</b> for projects that serve as a demonstration project and are transferable to other communities (i.e., innovative projects that provide deliverables that can be easily adopted by other communities or outline processes that will streamline other similar projects). Please outline what these deliverables are and how they will be shared with other communities.</li> <li>• Up to <b>2 points</b> for how project success will be measured and monitored. Please provide outcomes that can be linked to the project (e.g., reduction in flooding, increase in tree canopy cover, reduced risk of sewer overflows) and any metrics that the applicant will be able to track to indicate whether or not the project is accomplishing these outcomes over time. The review team <u>is not</u> looking for general statements around the completion of tasks in the scope of work (e.g., “the project is successful if we complete it on time”).</li> <li>• Up to <b>2 points</b> for clear description of plans for how any future maintenance needs of or updates to the proposed project would be addressed to ensure the project’s goals continue in the long-term. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>For Project Type 1: Planning, Assessments, Capacity Building, and Regulatory Updates–</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Describe how the project deliverables will be utilized to continue local resilience work (e.g., regular meetings to track identified plan actions, list anticipated town meeting dates and/or plan to approve updated regulations, how data collection or modeling will support current/scheduled local efforts, etc.)</li> <li>▪ If applicable, how will the plan, assessment, or regulation be updated in the future to make sure it stays current?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>For Project Type 2:</b> Design and Permitting – Describe the path forward for the project – construction, further regulatory approval, potential funding sources. Describe any initial plans for how the asset would be maintained into the future if/when implemented.</li> <li>○ <b>For Project Type 3:</b> Construction and On-the-Ground Implementation – Will this project produce an operation and maintenance plan? If applicable, who is responsible for future maintenance? If applicable, what is the plan for replacing the asset at the end of its useful life and how will you ensure the replacement asset is also resilient?</li> </ul>
<b><i>Need for Financial Assistance (6 points)</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to <b>4 points</b> based on the equalized valuation per capita, <b><u>to be completed by EEA</u></b></li> <li>• Up to <b>2 points</b> for financial need as demonstrated through Applicant narrative, as described below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Demonstration that the municipal budget cannot accommodate this project, including specific examples beyond regular budgetary constraints.</li> <li>○ Demonstration that other grant programs were considered, and it was determined that MVP was the best programmatic fit.</li> <li>○ Demonstration that MVP funding would clearly address a funding gap that would make an otherwise robust project unlikely to be implemented.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<b><i>Project Feasibility, Support, and Management (6 points)</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up to <b>2 points</b> for a description of the project team’s technical, financial, and management capacity. (Note: If your municipality has a previously awarded MVP Action Grant that will be ongoing at the same time as this proposed project, please list that grant and detail your municipality’s capacity to manage multiple grants in FY23.)</li> <li>• Up to <b>2 points</b> for letters of support from landowner, public, and/or community partners. Applications with 3+ letters of support from <u>diverse</u> groups (e.g., community-based organizations, local businesses, nonprofits, neighborhood groups, etc.) and a letter of support from landowner (if project is to take place on non-municipal land) will be scored highest. There is a place on the online form to upload support letters that have been combined into a single PDF document. Support letters should be submitted in this fashion and not sent in separately.</li> <li>• Up to <b>2 points</b> for good standing in the MVP program – based on timely submittal of progress reports, lack of project extensions, timely correspondence, and compliance with program guidelines, <b><u>to be completed by MVP program team.</u></b></li> </ul>
<b><i>Overall Project Quality (10 points)</i></b>	<b><u>To be allotted at the discretion of the review team.</u></b>