

40101(d) Subawards Scoresheet

Project Management Plan	Reviewer Comments
Project team possesses sufficient knowledge, experience, and skills to successfully execute the project	
Applicant has a demonstrated history of effective community engagement with EICs and/or DACs	
Project risks have been identified and reasonable mitigation strategies have been proposed	
Project has access to appropriate resources including infrastructure and facilities to allow project to move forward	
If applicable, project site has taken advantage of, or will seek to in parallel to this project, other MA programs related to energy efficiency, electrification, resilience, and clean energy. NOTE: If this criterion is not applicable to the proposed project, the Applicant may still receive up to full points in the Project Management Plan section.	
Applicant clearly demonstrates need for funding	
Applicant has identified a reasonable strategy to track metrics and progress toward identified outcomes. This strategy could involve collaboration with project partners such as CBCs.	
Budget is reasonable and well-justified	
Project Management Plan Score (0-35)	
Overall Comments	

Resilience and Reliability Benefits and Community Engagement	Reviewer Comments
Project identifies a meaningful resilience or reliability need and proposes a reasonable solution	
Applicant demonstrates that the project need was identified by or with the community (for example, the project addresses a need identified in a previous vulnerability assessment, such as via the Municipal Vulnerability Preparedness ("MVP") Program). For this criterion, "the community" may refer to municipal officials, community organizations, and/or other similar entities.	
Applicants have proposed a method to quantify the reliability or resilience benefits of project	
Project aligns with Program Objectives outlined in the program narrative	
Applicant demonstrates that the project aligns with and furthers the Commonwealth's CECP targets	
Project will be located in an EIC and/or a DAC	
Community Based Organization is part of the project leadership	
Community engagement activities have been conducted prior to applying for funding (e.g., applicant provides letters of support from community organizations, or otherwise demonstrates meaningful communications with the affected community members). Community members, including those beyond municipal government staff, have been engaged and demonstrate support for the project.	
Community engagement plan is proposed and demonstrates meaningful, thoughtful engagement. The community engagement is specific to the proposed project/program and additional to current community engagement activities (i.e., is incremental to any community engagement efforts that may already be conducted by the Applicant as regular course of business/operations). The following ideas could be considered; however, this is not an exhaustive list demonstrating meaningful, thoughtful engagement: - Have multiple types of outreach been conducted (e.g., paper flyers, public info/comment sessions, individual conversations with community members, and online information)? - Has information been made available in commonly spoken languages in the community? - How often will community members be engaged? At what points in the process? - What will the avenues be for meaningful community input that affects project design, implementation, outcomes, etc? - Will community members be compensated for their participation? - Have community members other than municipal officials been identified for engagement? - Have educational opportunities been planned to help the community understand clean energy technologies and the value of electrification when combined with resilience measures? - Will the project operate under Memorandums of Understanding with Community-Based Organizations? - Will this project engage Citizen Advisory Committees? - Has a Community Benefits Agreement been proposed?	
Applicant demonstrates that the anticipated benefits of the project (monetizable and non-monetizable) justify the expected project costs	
Resilience and Reliability Benefits and Community Engagement Score (0-50)	
Overall Comments	

Job Creation and Training and Associated Community Benefits	Reviewer Comments
Applicant plans to leverage existing or new workforce development-related partnerships (such as training providers or apprenticeship programs). Anticipated outcomes of these partnerships are meaningful and Applicant has proposed a reasonable method to monitor progress toward those outcomes.	
Project will provide access to newly created jobs or demonstrates other increases in employment opportunities	
Project will utilize project labor agreements, collective bargaining agreements, or other strategies to ensure fair compensation and working conditions.	
Meaningful metrics have been proposed to measure job creation and training outcomes (as described in Attachment F and in Section 5 of the Project Narrative - Attachment C).	
Applicant has developed a strategy to attract, train, and retain a skilled workforce	
Applicant plans to engage workers from EICs, DACs, local project communities, and/or other workers who are underrepresented or who have historically been excluded. Meaningful outcomes for these workers have been defined and a strategy to measure progress toward those outcomes has been identified. The strongest responses may also include a description of social support services that will be provided to enable workers from these communities to participate in job creation and/or training opportunities related to the project.	
Project exhibits a positive relationship with labor unions. This could include plans to hire union workers, opportunities to join a union as a result of the project, and/or pledged neutrality regarding union organizing by the Applicant.	
Meaningful metrics have been proposed to measure community benefits related to job creation and training outcomes (as described in Attachment F and in Section 6 of the Project Narrative - Attachment C).	
Workforce Development Score (0-15)	
Overall Comments	

Additional Selection Criteria	Reviewer Comments
-------------------------------	-------------------

Scoring Guidelines

0-5 points	Proposal does not address the Project Management scoring criteria or is otherwise inadequate.
6-10 points	Proposal addresses at least some of the Project Management scoring criteria, but is either incomplete or contains significant flaws. Proposal is inadequate.
11-15 points	Proposal addresses the Project Management Plan scoring criteria, but contains some flaws that raise concerns.
16-20 points	Proposal is adequate. There are flaws or areas for improvement, but the Proposal meets basic expectations.
21 -25 points	Proposal is good; there may be some minor flaws or areas for improvement, but these do not detract from the overall quality of the proposal.
26 - 30 points	Proposal is very good; Project Management Plan does not present any obvious room for improvement
31-35 points	Excellent; proposal exceeds expectations outlined in application. The applicant may propose an exceptional solution or creative approach.

0-10 points	Proposal does not address the Resilience and Reliability Benefits and Community Engagement scoring criteria or is otherwise inadequate.
11-20 points	Proposal addresses at least some of the scoring criteria, but is either incomplete or contains significant flaws. Proposal is inadequate.
21-30 points	Proposal addresses the scoring criteria, but contains some flaws that raise concerns.
31-35 points	Proposal is adequate. There are flaws or areas for improvement, but the Proposal meets basic expectations
36-40 points	Proposal is good; there may be some minor flaws or areas for improvement, but these do not detract from the overall quality of the proposal.
41 - 45 points	Proposal is very good; identified benefits and community engagement plan does not present any obvious room for improvement.
46-50 points	Excellent; Proposal exceeds expectations outlined in application. The applicant may propose an exceptional solution or creative approach, or provide an otherwise excellent proposal.

0-1 point	Proposal does not address the Job Creation and Training scoring criteria or is otherwise inadequate.
2 - 4 points	Proposal addresses at least some of the Job Creation and Training scoring criteria, but is either incomplete or contains significant flaws. Proposal is inadequate.
5 - 7 points	Proposal addresses the Job Creation and Training scoring criteria, but contains some flaws that raise concerns.
7 - 9 points	Proposal is adequate. There are flaws or areas for improvement, but the proposal meets basic expectations.
9 - 11 points	Proposal is good; there may be some minor flaws or areas for improvement, but these do not detract from the overall quality of the proposal.
12 - 13 points	Proposal is very good; Job Creation and Training plan does not present any obvious room for improvement.
14-15 points	Excellent; proposal exceeds expectations outlined in application. The applicant may propose an exceptional solution or creative approach.

Note to reviewers: One of the goals of the program is to Create good-paying jobs with the free and fair choice to join a union. However, most project funding will be directed toward resilience hardware and other infrastructure costs. Additionally, there may be a wide range of proposed job creation/training activities proposed across application due to the variation in eligible project types. Please keep these considerations in mind when scoring this section.

1. Project incorporates innovative, replicable, and scalable financing approaches and business models that could support development of reliability and resilience solutions beyond the Federal funding available in this solicitation;	
Business model or financing approach is a new approach for the applicant or for the industry, or otherwise demonstrates innovation	
Business model or financing approach could be replicated and scaled following this project without assistance from grant funding	
2. Develops a solution for private buildings that have a public benefit (e.g., grocery stores, gas stations), and provides associated proposals for arrangements that allow the public use of the resilience benefits at the private sites when needed (e.g., during outages greater than a certain duration)	
Application provides adequate description of public-private partnership	
Demonstrated support from all parties	
Approach to partnership is replicable and/or scalable	
Partnership would provide a meaningful benefit to the community	
3. Projects that support resilience needs and provide distributed public benefits that may not attract private capital	
Project provides a valuable resilience solution that serves the public good	
Applicant provides justification explaining why this project would have difficulty attracting funding from the private sector (e.g., the benefits provided by the project would not be easily factored into a cost-benefit analysis)	
Additional Selection Criteria Score (0-20) (Bonus Points)	
Overall Comments	

Total Score	0
--------------------	----------

Do you recommend this proposal for further review and possible funding?

Additional Comments: Please provide any additional comments to supplement your thinking behind the scores	
---	--

0 points	The proposal does not propose a project that addresses one of the Additional Selection Criteria
1-5 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria, but is either incomplete or contains significant flaws.
6-9 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria, but contains some flaws that raise concerns.
10-12 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria, and provides a reasonable solution. However, the application has notable areas for improvement.
13 - 15 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria and provides a compelling solution. Response is good; there may be some minor flaws or areas for improvement, but these do not detract from the overall quality of the response.
16 - 18 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria and provides a very compelling solution without obvious areas for improvement.
19 - 20 points	The proposal addresses at least one of the Additional Selection Criteria and provides an extremely compelling solution. The solution is novel, creative, and presents an exciting new direction for the industry.