



A. COMMUNITY IDENTIFICATION	
<p>Background: These questions are designed to understand why the applicant is proposing to work in the identified community and why this community can benefit from a robust and meaningful engagement process.</p>	<p>Metrics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrates that the community falls under one of the following: low-income, high concentration of people of color facing specific needs, seniors, youth, LGBTQI+, immigrant population, language barriers, housing cost-burdened, low educational attainment, facing a disability, has limited mobility, or is in an underserved rural area, OR appropriately describes another concern of the community. Alternatively can highlight high-opportunity areas that would benefit. 2. Clearly describes how the community was selected and determined as a local priority by describing the specific demographics and any unique challenges of the community.
<p>Narrative/Application Question: Please describe the community you intend to work with / in and how it was identified as an area that could benefit from the EEI program by addressing the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe why this community is being selected - describe any criteria, tools, or methods that were used to identify the area or how community voices have been used in picking this area. 2. What is the make-up of the community? Please include demographics, specific challenges this community may have, opportunities and assets that can be brought up, if it is urban, suburban, or rural (if rural please add any unique challenges the community faces), and/or any other description that is important to recognize for this community. 	

A. COMMUNITY IDENTIFICATION	
Rubric	Points Possible: 10 (up to +5 if rural)
Non-Responsive: Applicant does not identify a community or how it was it selected.	0 points
Low (not recommended): Applicant identified a community, but does not adequately describe why the community was selected or the make-up of the community that identifies it as an area with high potential of benefiting from EEI. Applicant does not show why this community should be considered, or the identified community does not demonstrate a great enough need.	1 – 4 points



E EI Rubric

<p>Medium (acceptable for funding): The identified community demonstrates a need for meaningful engagement and investment to identify ways to improve opportunities. The community is identified as disinvested in some capacity and shows options for high-opportunities, but the narrative may lack in the following ways: *Does not provide a strong enough narrative as to how or why this community was selected *Does not provide a strong enough narrative demonstrating an understanding of the community make-up and challenges they face.</p> <p>If the applicant describes a rural community, they should provide explanation of any challenges unique to the rural context. If they have an acceptable answer, add up to an additional five (5) points to the overall score under.</p>	<p>5 – 7 points (up to +5 points if identified as rural)</p>
<p>High (recommended for funding): The identified community demonstrates a great need for meaningful engagement and investment. The applicant demonstrates the high opportunities that exist when the community is invested in and describes clearly how and why this community was selected among the many communities they could have picked; has a strong understanding of the make-up of this community and challenges they have faced because of it.</p> <p>If the applicant describes a rural community, they provide an explanation of any challenges unique to the rural context. If they have an acceptable answer, add up to an additional five (5) points to the overall score under.</p>	<p>8 – 10 (up to +5 if identified as rural)</p>
<p>Justification:</p>	<p>Total Points Awarded:</p>



B. HISTORICAL UNDERSTANDING	
<p>Background: This section is designed to gauge the applicant's understanding on how the identified community has been harmed or neglected by, including, but not limited to, government policies, socioeconomic issues, infrastructure design, etc. It is also an opportunity for the applicant to demonstrate their perspectives of possible opportunities that can be leveraged through the program and show their documentation of previous engagement.</p>	<p>Metrics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrates a strong understanding of the historical issues the identified community has faced, including outlining specific policies or norms affecting the community and which systems have caused the greatest inequities. 2. Demonstrates a strong understanding of the current barriers/challenges faced by this community that can be addressed through the EEI funding program, such as government policies, socioeconomic issues, infrastructure design, etc. 3. Provides sufficient information describing any engagement that has happened in the community in the past 10 years. If no engagement has happened in the last 10 years, they can share reasons as to why that is. <i>(Previous engagement is NOT required, but we want to know if there have been efforts).</i>
<p>Narrative/Application Question: Please describe the community's current challenges or barriers, while also considering how this relates to historical harms or factors that include, but are not limited to, government policies, socioeconomic issues, infrastructure design, etc.:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide a thorough overview of the historical factors that have created inequities within the community that was selected. 2. What policies, cultural norms, systems, and/or values currently exist or have impacted this community and created inequities for too long without positive impacts that this project/partnership seeks to change? 3. Please also include relevant information and share any applicable documentation of previous engagement done in this area in the last 10 years. 	



EEl Rubric

B. HISTORICAL UNDERSTANDING	
Rubric	Points Possible: 10
<p>Non-Responsive: Applicant does not describe any current challenges or connections to historical harms. No discussion of previous engagement.</p>	0 points
<p>Low (not recommended): The applicant either cannot, or very minimally, demonstrate(s) an understanding of current barriers/challenges and the connection to historical harms. Have no, or very limited, insight into previous engagement efforts.</p>	1 – 4 points
<p>Medium (acceptable for funding): The applicant demonstrates an understanding of current barriers/challenges but may not have a clear understanding of historical harm or can identify historical harm but not a clear identification of current barriers/challenges.</p> <p>The narrative does not clearly show the challenges/or opportunities and does not provide specific history. The applicant may show some history of previous engagement but not in full detail.</p> <p><i>Note - no engagement in the last ten years doesn't mean the application is uncompetitive; rather, we want applicants to note the lack of engagement and offer any insight as to why that might be the case, or if there has been engagement what has been done with it and how can this effort help.</i></p>	5 – 7 points
<p>High (recommended for funding): Application demonstrates a strong understanding of current barriers/challenges in relation to historical harms such as, physical barriers like roads that divide a community, historical policies like redlining, socioeconomic issues like concentrations of poverty/Title 1 schools, policies that neglected older communities, or other issues challenging the community. The applicant will show a strong understanding of what the issues are today and why they exist in the community. They will also be able to demonstrate any and all engagement efforts that have occurred in the community within at least the last 10 years, including the purpose of outreach, number of people engaged, and what was done with the information/how was it implemented. An acceptable description can also be that no engagement has happened in the last 10 years and provide any insight as to why that is.</p>	8 – 10 points
<p>Justification:</p>	Total Points Awarded:



C-1. PARTNERSHIP (Co-applicants)	
<p>Background: This section is designed for the applicant and their selected community partner to demonstrate a strong partnership and dedication in working together for this program. EEI wants to fund strong partnerships between cities/counties and community-based organizations as a way to invest in trust-building and create pathways for residents to be more engaged in the planning process, to create future projects that advance equity, and meet community needs.</p>	<p>Metrics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a strong partnership described with clear roles and responsibilities outlined. 2. There is a clear structure for how decisions will be made between the partners and clear communication tactics to help with that. 3. Demonstrates a strong partnership effort beyond the two identified parties, including additional CBOs, local leaders, additional local agencies, or other partners.
<p>Narrative/Application Question: Please identify the community-based organization you will be working with by addressing the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Describe your partnership structure and key roles and responsibilities. 2. How will decisions be made? How will you communicate across partners? 3. What other partners are important to making this effort successful, and how do you plan to engage them? Identify other partners that can help this effort be successful, including other government agencies or departments and other community organizations, non-profits, schools, churches, or other entities. 	
C-2. PARTNERSHIP (Individual CBO or Tribal Government)	
<p>Background: Background: This question is designed for the individual CBO or tribal government applicant to demonstrate a partnership and dedication in working together with local government agencies and other partners, even if applying independently. For tribal governments, this is to show overall partnership with community groups and any opportunity to engage with other local governments. EEI wants to fund strong partnerships with cities/counties, tribal governments, and community-organizations as a way to invest in trust-building and creating pathways for residents to be more engaged in the planning process and so resulting in future projects that advance equity and meet their needs.</p>	<p>Metrics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identifies all partners that will be engaged in the process and describes any previous work with them. 2. There is a clear structure for how decisions will be made between the partners and clear communication tactics to help with that. 3. Clearly states roles and responsibilities of all partners.



EEI Rubric

	4. Clearly demonstrates how decisions will be made.
<p>Narrative/Application Question: Please identify key partnerships needed to implement this effort. Please also describe your partnership by addressing the following items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the local government you will be informing/connecting with and any additional partnerships and how you plan to engage them. Have you worked with them before? 2. How will you keep partners (city/county/CBOs) informed and communicate with them? 3. Describe your partnership structure and key roles and responsibilities with the identified partners. 4. How will decisions be made? 	
<p>C-1. PARTNERSHIP (Co-applicants)</p>	
<p>Rubric</p>	<p>Points Possible: 20</p>
<p>Non-Responsive: Applicant does not identify a partner or process for decision-making or communication. Also does not include any information on other possible partners.</p>	<p>0 points</p>
<p>Low (not recommended): The applicant identifies a community-based organization, but does not specify decision-making and communication processes. Omits details in the narrative and does not provide a sense of strong collaboration and partnership.</p>	<p>1 – 6 points</p>
<p>Medium (acceptable for funding): The applicant identifies a community-based organization and shares any history, if existent, of their relationship. They describe and identify decision-making or communication process and may include some possible additional partners/supporters for this work. The application may be missing additional detail, strategies that demonstrate strong processes for communication and decision-making.</p> <p>May be missing detail, strategies, or a willingness to share control over outcomes and decision making. The selected CBO may not be as well connected with the community.</p>	<p>7 - 15 points</p>
<p>High (recommended for funding): The applicant identifies a community-based organization and shares any history that may exist within their relationship. They identify a clear and concise decision-making process that outlines specific strategies, including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defined community representation and inclusion in the decision-making process. • Focus groups or committees. • Intent for transparency within the partnership and with the community. 	<p>15 - 20points</p>



EEI Rubric

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitation procedures for unforeseen challenges. <p>Going beyond involvement and outreach, the proposal may outline a formal governance structure, program, or agreement that would be created to build the capacity for the lead agency to give community greater representation and voice in ongoing transportation and land use decision making with regards to the proposed improvement area.</p> <p>The identified partner is a trusted CBO in the community and will clearly be an asset to the program.</p>	
<p>Justification:</p>	<p>Total Points Awarded:</p>
<p>C-2. PARTNERSHIP (Individual CBO or Tribal Government)</p>	
<p>Rubric</p>	<p>Points Possible: 20</p>
<p>Non-Responsive: Applicant does not identify a process for collaborative decision-making or communication. Also does not include any information on possible partners.</p>	<p>0 points</p>
<p>Low (not recommended): The applicant identifies a key partner, but does not specify decision-making and communication processes. Omits details in the narrative and does not provide a sense of strong collaboration and partnership. For CBO only applicants, they do not identify a city/county as a key partner nor do they include a letter of support.</p>	<p>1 – 6 points</p>
<p>Medium (acceptable for funding): As a CBO-only applicant, they identify a city or county and share any history, if existent, of their relationship.</p> <p>For Tribal Governments-only, they identify additional partnerships that can be local governments, other tribes, CBOs, etc.</p> <p>The applicant describes and identifies decision-making or communication processes with external partners. The application may be missing additional detail, strategies that demonstrate strong processes for communication and decision-making.</p>	<p>7 - 15 points</p>
<p>High (recommended for funding):</p>	<p>15 - 20points</p>



EEI Rubric

<p>Going beyond involvement and outreach, the proposal may outline a formal governance structure, program, or agreement that would be created to build the capacity for the lead agency to give community greater representation and voice in ongoing transportation and land use decision making with regards to the proposed improvement area.</p> <p>As a CBO only applicant, they identify a city or county and share any history, if existent, of their relationship.</p> <p>For Tribal Governments only, they identify additional partnerships that can be local governments, other tribes, CBOs, etc.</p> <p>The applicant describes and identifies a clear and concise decision-making process that outlines specific strategies, including, but not limited to: defined community representation and inclusion in the decision-making process; focus groups or committees; intent for transparency within the partnership and with the community; facilitation procedures for unforeseen challenges.</p> <p>Going beyond involvement and outreach, the proposal outlines a formal governance structure, program, or agreement that would be created to build the capacity for the lead agency to give community greater representation and voice in ongoing transportation and land use decision making with regards to the proposed improvement area.</p>	
<p>Justification:</p>	<p>Total Points Awarded:</p>



D. INCORPORATING THE COMMUNITY

<p>Background: This program is intended to support a process that creates a partnership with the community at the beginning of the planning process, including them in the assessment of needs and ideation of solutions in order to agree on a path forward.</p>	<p>Metrics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Demonstrates clear outreach strategies or participatory methods for the identified community to engage with. 2. Identify specific milestones and indicators of success that measure the outreach strategies or participatory methods. 3. Demonstrates how transparency across partners and the community will be shared, including communications and governance structures that will be created to bring a diverse and representative voice to the outreach.
--	---

Narrative/Application Question:
Please describe the intended approach for the community engagement by addressing the following:

1. Key strategies and/or participatory methods the community will participate in (focus groups, committees, community ambassadors, surveys, etc.).
2. Milestones or key indicators of success of the engagement strategies.
3. Please describe how you plan to show transparency to the community within the engagement process.

Rubric	Points Possible: 15
Non-Responsive: Applicant does not respond or address any form of community inclusion plan.	0 points
Low (not recommended): The approach for community engagement is loosely defined and does not provide details on the engagement strategies. Milestones or key indicators are either missing or not clearly defined.	1 – 6 points
Medium (acceptable for funding): The application identifies some strategies or participatory methods for a meaningful engagement process. There are some milestone and indicators for progress/success. Identifies a governance and communication structure for transparency, but may not be as robust.	7 – 10 points
High (recommended for funding): The application clearly identifies various strategies and/or participatory methods that take into account knowledge and understanding of the community and what is likely to succeed. There is thoughtful variety, if applicable, in the strategy. The strategies/methods have a clear start and end and identify key milestones and indicators of success. The application identifies a governance and communication structure describing how community members will be invited to participate, methods of transparency, and measures of accountability.	11 – 15 points
Justification:	Total Points Awarded:



EEI Rubric

E-1. BUDGET (Partnership)		
Background: This program is about investing in CBOs as trusted partners in planning to result in more equitable projects in the future. The budget should reflect a minimum 50/50 split with the CBO and jurisdiction, accordingly, to enable the CBO to be the lead engagement partner and the city as a supporting partner and fiscal agent, with a goal of seeing up to 70% go to the CBO partner. The budget should be identified in the scope of work.	Metrics: 1. Budget allocates 50% or more to the CBO and 50% or less to the lead jurisdiction/government entity. 2. Scope of work is broken up by tasks and costs and is included in the scope of work.	
Narrative/Application Question: Please include a budget that breaks out the scope of work within specific tasks and associated costs.		
E-2. BUDGET (Individual)		
Background: This program is about investing in CBOs as trusted partners in planning to result in more equitable projects in the future. The budget should reflect the role of the CBOs as the lead engagement facilitator and fiscal agent.	Metrics: 1. Scope of work broken up by tasks and costs – identifies any tasks or costs that are not federal funding eligible.	
Narrative/Application Question: Please include a budget that breaks out the scope of work within specific tasks and associated costs. Please identify all anticipated costs.		

Formatted Table



EEl Rubric

E.1 BUDGET (Partnerships)	
Rubric	Points Possible: 15
Non-Responsive: No budget is included.	0 points
Low (not recommended): The budget is not a minimum of a 50/50 split for CBOs and jurisdiction respectively. It does not identify the engagement and additional work by tasks and related costs.	1 – 6 points
Medium (acceptable for funding): The application has a minimum of a 50/50 split for CBOs and jurisdictions. It shows the proposed work broken out by tasks and associated costs for each effort.	7 – 10 points
High (recommended for funding): The application exceeds the 50/50 minimum split for CBOs and jurisdictions. It shows the proposed work broken out by tasks and associated costs. The budget and scope are detailed and outline the cost associated by each activity; breakout specific compensation plans for community members and partners; there is a clear split between the federal scope/budget and a non-federal scope/budget.	11 – 15 points
Justification:	Total Points Awarded:
E.2 BUDGET (Individual)	
Rubric	Points Possible: 15
Non-Responsive: No budget is included.	0 points
Low (not recommended): The budget does not identify the engagement and work by tasks and related costs.	1 – 6 points
Medium (acceptable for funding): The application shows the proposed work broken out by tasks and associated costs for each effort.	7 – 10 points
High (recommended for funding): The application shows the proposed work broken out by tasks and associated costs. The budget and scope are detailed and outline the cost associated by each activity; breakout specific compensation plans for community members and partners; there is a clear split between the federal scope/budget and a non-federal scope/budget.	11 – 15 points
Justification:	Total Points Awarded:



F. SCOPE OF WORK	
<p>Background: Through the scope of work, we want to see the actualization of all the elements that application addresses, including effectively describing the work that will be done to implement the goals of EEI through meaningful community engagement and collaboration between CBOs and government entities.</p>	<p>Metrics:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scope of work reflects the various questions in the application including the required tasks as identified in the scope of work template: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Showing distinct roles and responsibilities for strong partnerships, including the clear roles and responsibilities. b. Identified resources like other local departments, resources, agencies, etc. c. Understanding of historical harms and community history with engagement and using engagement tactics that meet the communities where they are. d. Final deliverable. e. Evaluation Metrics.
<p>Narrative/Application Question: Please include a complete proposed scope of work that outlines all the intended work broken out by specific tasks. <i>Note: SACOG may identify high-ranking applications and work with the applicant on re-scoping and clarifying edits as needed.</i></p>	
Rubric	Points Possible: 25
<p>Non-Responsive: No scope of work is included.</p>	0 points
<p>Low (not recommended): The scope of work does not include the required tasks or is incomplete.</p>	1 – 8 points
<p>Medium (acceptable for funding): The scope of work includes the required elements as identified through the scope of work template.</p>	9 – 17 points
<p>High (recommended for funding): The scope of work includes the required elements as identified through the scope of work template. The scope identifies very detailed deliverables and encompasses all elements of this rubric with each piece falling within the highest rank for recommendation.</p>	18 – 25 points
<p>Justification:</p>	Total Points Awarded: